

NOTES AND DIVINE, AND OF

No. 10.

OFFICIAL COMMUNION.	400
Remarks on an Article in the Evangelical Witness.	400
On the Question, May a man marry his deceased Wife.	401
On Marriage. (Continued from page 405.)	402
SABBATH.	402
Letters on the Abolition. (See 1.)	402
Remarks on an Article in the Edinburgh Review.	402
Roberts Review. (Continued from page 406.)	403
SUMMARY OF ELLIOT'S "WILLIAM."	403
Prediction—Sandwich, U.S.A.	403
OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.	404
On the Alleged Confession of Christ.	404
The Social Condition of Christ.	404
The American Slave Society.	404
Journal of the Evangelical Society.	405
OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.	406
Insurance and Compensation in England.	406
The case of Margery.	409
VIEW OF WORLD CRISES.	410
Europe—Great Britain—France—Spain—Greece—South America—United States.	410

Hold fast the form of sound words. For there are certain men who, through ignorance, have come into the world, corrupting the truth of God into heresies, and denying the truth of God, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the highways, and mark for the nations, where in the good will one walk alone, and ye shall find rest. Ye shall know

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY WHITNEY AND WOOD,

No. 11, Wall Street.

Price, 12 m.

The Postmaster General has issued a regulation, requiring all persons who have sent to any place in the United States, or to any place outside of the United States, any printed matter, by post, to affix to their packages, in their own handwriting, the following notice:

NOTICE OF POSTAL LAW.

There is now issued by the Postmaster General, containing 24 pages, upon which there are 10 pages, and consequently the postage of one dollar.

Carried to any part of the United States,
The following extract from the Post-Office law will show that
it is to be carried. "That Magazines and newspapers are
published periodically, may be transported or transmitted at one
and a half cents a sheet, in any distance not exceeding one hundred miles; and two and a half cents for every greater distance."

NOTICE TO PATRONS.

There have been several indications for the current volume of this Magazine, which we are unable to supply, in consequence of the back numbers having run out of print; in those instances where the money has been forwarded, it will be passed to the credit of the individual who has sent it, and the fourth volume sent them in lieu of the third.

It is expected of those who have had the third volume sent them, and who have not yet paid for it, that they will cause the amount of their subscription to be in readiness at Pittsburgh, at the next annual meeting of the Associate Synod, in May, where a person will be in waiting authorized to receive it, and give receipt. Those who may not have the opportunity thus to send their money, are requested to send it by mail, at our risk, and where there is more than Five Dollars enclosed, at our expense. We trust this notice will be punctually attended to especially when it is borne in mind that our terms are \$2 in advance, and \$2.50 at the end of the year, and that it is mere matter of accommodation that \$2 are received any time within the year. Those who shall have not complied with the above request, will be charged \$2.50.

Friends located near, and well desirous to become subscribers for the Fourth Volume, are requested to send in their names at the meeting of Synod, with the name or place of the Post-Office where they wish their sent. The plan of publication for the fourth volume, on all essential particulars, will be the same as it now is. It will be estimated a labor, and greatly contribute to our ability to make the work useful and interesting, to receive pay in advance. Friends thus paying may be confident of receiving the work regularly (accidents excepted); for, after notifying the publisher we are going on with a volume, that volume will be published (Providence permitting) even though it should be attended with loss on our part.

THE
Religious Monitor,
OR
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

No. 10.

MARCH, 1827.

VOL. III.

Original Communications.

To the Editor of the Religious Monitor,
SIR,

I thank you for having given the few Remarks, which I sent you, a place in your last No. I herewith send you a few more, and I fear I shall have to trouble you again, because I have not yet been able to notice all the statements made in the Evangelical Witness, on which I wish to animadvert.—Yours, &c. A. H.

**REMARKS ON STATEMENTS MADE IN THE
EVANGELICAL WITNESS.**

“*Nil de mortuis nisi bonum*,” that is, say nothing to injure the reputation of the dead, was the favourite maxim of an ancient author. Perhaps that writer thought it was hardly fair dealing, to make any attack on the character or principles of those who had departed this life, because they had no longer an opportunity to say any thing in their own vindication. This would be something like fighting with the dead : a species of warfare in which, it is true, no great honour can be acquired ; but then it has this advantage, that it may be carried on with great safety. A living ass can kick a dead lion.* Now although I do not carry my ideas of respect for the dead quite so far as this author did, yet I cordially agree to the proposed improvement of this sentiment by a modern writer, viz—“that we should say nothing but truth about the dead.” I do not mean to say that we should not speak the truth about the living also, which is indeed a most incumbent duty, but that we should if possible be still more on our guard against misrepresenting the sentiments and principles that have been held by those that are dead; not only because they can say nothing in their own defence, but also from our knowledge of the fact that we shall soon be in the same state ourselves. “There is no device in the grave whither thou goest.”

* Vide Æsop's Fables.

I am sorry to think that our friend, the editor of the Evangelical Witness, seems to have lost sight of this excellent maxim when writing about those faithful ministers of Christ, who were the Fathers of the Secession Church in Scotland, and who have long since been called to their rest. In the following passage, extracted from the Evangelical Witness, there are some insinuations altogether unfounded indeed, but very injurious to the well-established reputation of those eminent men. "When the Erskines seceded from the Scottish Establishment for a part of the errors that had induced Mr. McMillan before them to abandon the same communion, a hope was entertained by the Reformed Presbyterians, that they would accede to the good old cause. In this hope, however, they were disappointed. The Seceding ministers had large congregations, in which there were many members, and those the most wealthy, whose only or chief objection to the Established Church, was patronage. They were not willing that some opulent laird or nobleman, who was often the most ungodly man in the whole parish, should choose their minister, and force him on them by an armed soldiery, as frequently happened. This was patronage, and this they opposed; but here their opposition ended. Such men were not likely to abandon all unholy connexion with the government, and attach themselves to the Reformed Presbyterian Church. The Erskines, Moncrieff, and Fisher, who formed the Secession Presbytery, availed themselves of other corruptions of the Establishment, besides patronage, in their opposition, and in vindicating their Secession. In many of their sermons, and in a Testimony which they published, they exhibited a body of sound evangelical doctrine. At first, they were in principle Covenanters; perhaps in all points; but their congregations, at least many of them were not, except in their opposition to patronage." Vol. iv. p. 505.

In remarking on this passage from the Evangelical Witness, I shall begin by acknowledging the candour of the editor, so far as it goes, in allowing to these men the credit of being at least sound in the faith. "In many of their sermons, and in a Testimony which they published, they exhibited a sound body of evangelical doctrine." This is saying much in favour both of their preaching and profession. So far as I can gather from the article from which this extract is taken, the only thing alleged against them is, that they did not attach themselves to the Reformed Presbyterian Church. This "one thing" they lacked; and nothing else is laid to their charge. Now I find no fault with the editor of the Evangelical Witness for thinking they ought to have attached themselves to the Reformed Presbyterian

Church. This, in fact, is only to think that they should have done as he himself has done. But I do complain of him for reflecting on their motives, when there is so good reason for believing them to have been perfectly disinterested and pure.

The candid reader will observe, that in the above-mentioned extract, the principles of the Erskines, Moncrieff, and Fisher, the Fathers of the Secession Church, are represented to be of that accommodating character, that they made them yield to their own convenience. It is even insinuated that they would have attached themselves to the Reformed Presbyterian Church, had they been able to carry their congregations along with them; and that regard to the wealthy members of their churches hindered them from abandoning all unholy connexion with the government. But, sir, that person must be ignorant indeed of the history of these excellent men, who does not know that they were remarkable for their firm and unyielding adherence to what they believed to be the truth of God—that few men have ever manifested more firmness of mind and consistency of conduct, and that few men have ever given more satisfactory evidence of their sincerity. Had the Fathers of the Secession Church been men of such principles as they are here represented to have been, truly it would have been a most absurd thing for them to become Seceders at all. They had nothing to induce them to become Seceders, but a sense of duty and their attachment to truth. They were men of talents, and of high standing in the church: they were highly respected in the community, and their stipends* were nearly as good as any in the country. By seceding from the national church, they knew they would suffer reproach and become objects of suspicion to the civil authorities, and that they would be expelled from their respective churches and deprived of their stipends. One would suppose that had they been men who could make their principles yield to convenience, they must have found it wonderfully convenient to remain in the Established Church, and enjoy their livings. Truly it manifests great recklessness of mind to hazard such conjectures, and it is something too late to throw out such insinuations against such men.

The Erskines are also brought into comparison with Mr. McMillan. They are said to have "seceded from the Scottish Church for a part of the errors that had induced Mr. McMillan before them to abandon the same connexion." Now Mr. McMillan did not abandon the Scottish Church, but was deposed from the ministry by the Presbytery of Kirkcudbright, to which

* Stipend is the technical word in Scotland, for clergymen's salary.

sentence of deposition he for some time submitted, and which was also confirmed by the General Assembly.* It was in these circumstances that he was called by the Societies, when contrary to the sentence to which he had submitted, he resumed the exercise of his ministry. The case then stands thus: Mr. McMillan accepted a call to exercise his ministry among the Societies, after he had been deposed, and was no longer permitted to exercise it in the national church. But the Erskines voluntarily renounced all connexion with that church, and absolutely refused to return into her communion, unless the Assembly would retrace their steps, and do something to vindicate the cause of truth, which they had injured. This moreover they did at the very time (in 1734) when the Assembly passed an act empowering the Synod of Perth and Stirling to restore the Seceding ministers to the communion of the church and to their respective ministerial charges. Notwithstanding all this, I will not use so much freedom as to insinuate that Mr. McMillan's principles were of such a yielding character as to lead him to accept the call from the Societies merely because he could do no better. This would be to imitate a practice of which I cannot approve. But I think the facts just mentioned, and they are facts that cannot be called in question, render such a supposition much more reasonable, than that the Erskines, Moncrieff, and Fisher, were men of such principles as they are represented to have been in the Evangelical Witness.

Among our Reformed Presbyterian brethren, it has been a favourite method of accounting for the conduct of the first Seceders, in not attaching themselves to Mr. McMillan and the Societies, (for there was then no Reformed Presbytery,†) by representing them as afraid of giving offence to the civil authorities, and perhaps of exposing themselves to persecution. Thus, in Reformed Principles Exhibited, it is asserted, that "The Seceders knew, from the history of the suffering Covenanters, that it was less dangerous to their worldly ease and comfort to despise the censures and disown the authority of the church, than to dissent from the civil constitution, by condemning its principles and disowning its magistracy." Part I. p. 112. Now who, on read-

* Vide Act against schism and disorders, and anent Mr. John McMillan and Mr. John Hepburn, dated Edinburgh, 30th March, 1704.

† In the above article taken from the Evangelical Witness, Mr. McMillan and the Society people are called Reformed Presbyterians, by way of anticipation: otherwise there is a slight anachronism; for the Reformed Presbytery did not exist for many years after the Secession took place. The Reformed Presbytery was constituted by Mr. McMillan, who had been minister of Balmagie, and Mr. Thomas Nairn, who left the Secession Church about the year 1743.

ing this, would not suppose that Reformed Presbyterians in Scotland, were exposed to greater hardships than other dissenters in the same country? Who would not suppose but there must have been greater danger in condemning some of the principles of the civil constitution, than in disowning the authority of the church? Who would not suppose but that there must have existed at some time at least some foundation for such a declaration? But the truth is, there never has existed the shadow of a reason for such a statement; and it is not easy to account for its ever having appeared in the Testimony of the Reformed Church, unless it be intended for effect. I believe it is generally known that in most countries where there is an established church, that establishment makes part of the law of the country where it exists. At all events, this was the case in Scotland, in the days of Mr. McMillan and the Erskines, and this is sufficient for our present purpose. From this fact it will be seen, that there was precisely the same danger in disowning the authority of the church, as in disowning the civil authority: at least in so far as Mr. McMillan ever did. In the reigns of Charles II. and his brother James, we are furnished with an apt illustration of this statement. In their time Episcopacy was established by law in Scotland; and because the Presbyterians would not attend the ministry of the episcopal clergy, they were just as much exposed to persecution as if they had disowned the king's authority. It was this persecution for their religion that made most of the Presbyterians look upon these kings as incorrigible tyrants, perverting all the ends of government; and therefore they disowned their authority, and heartily concurred in bringing about the Revolution. After this, persecution for religion ceased in Scotland, by the provisions of the toleration act. From this period there was no more danger from the civil authority in joining one body of Dissenters, than another.

Let us now suppose that in these circumstances, one minister of the Established Church had joined Mr. McMillan, and another the Associate Presbytery, what danger would there have been in the one case more than in the other? None whatever. The truth is there would have been no danger in either case, but of their being deposed from their office, of being loosed from their congregations and deprived of their stipends by the church; and in case of disregarding the authority of the church, they would have been expelled by the civil authorities. But we need not suppose a case, for this is what actually happened, both in the case of Mr. McMillan, and in the case of the Erskines, Moncrieff, and Fisher. It seems that Mr. McMillan wished to live in the

manse, and preach in the kirk of Balmaghie, after he was deposed; and the consequence was, that the General Assembly directed their Commission to apply to the civil power to effect his removal.* In like manner the General Assembly passed an act in 1740 for deposing the several members of the Associate Presbytery, and gave immediate notice to those invested with civil authority, in the different places of their residence, "that they might be removed from their several churches. So that the danger was precisely the same in both cases; and this was neither more nor less than just the loss of the manse, the kirk, and the stipend. So that there must have been some other reason for the Erskines, &c. not attaching themselves to Mr. McMillan, than danger to their "ease and comfort;" for after the kirk, and the manse, and the stipend, were gone, there was no other danger to be apprehended from joining Mr. McMillan. And as they are generally allowed to have been men of great integrity and honour, they are surely entitled to our credit; and they have affirmed that their principal reason for not joining Mr. McMillan and the Society people, was the "strange fancies" of that people "about the nature and ends of civil government." Another reason for believing this to have been the case, is the well-known fact, that Mr. Thomas Nairn, one of the Seceding ministers, took up the same fancies, and actually joined Mr. McMillan, by whose assistance the first Reformed Presbytery was constituted.

It is further stated in the Evangelical Witness, that the Seceding ministers "were at first, in principle, Covenanters perhaps in all points." This is precisely what the Secession Church has always professed to be; and she has moreover given better evidence of her sincerity than any other church with which the writer of this article professes to be acquainted. He does not by any means wish to call in question the sincerity of Reformed Presbyterians in professing their attachment to the Covenanted Reformation. But there is no evidence of their sincerity, further than their profession; for so far as he can learn, the practice of Covenanting has been laid aside by Reformed Presbyterians for more than seventy years.† On the contrary, the Associate Church has not only stedfastly professed her adherence to the whole of the Covenanted Reformation, but has frequently given evidence of her sincerity by solemn Covenanting. This has

* See Recommendations to the Commission for applying to the civil magistrate for removing the deposed Mr. John McMillan from the kirk and manse of Balmaghie, in the acts of the General Assembly, dated April, 1705.

† See A Discourse on the sin and danger of opposition to public Religious Covenanting, by the Rev. Mr. (now Dr.) W. C. Brownlee. page 50.

been the case both in Scotland and in the United States. So that it will be obvious that Reformed Presbyterians may be, and I believe are, Covenanters in principle, because they so profess themselves to be; and that Associate Presbyterians are Covenanters both in principle and practice, because they profess their adherence to a Covenanted Reformation, and practice the duty of solemn Cevenanting.

For the Religious Monitor.

ON THE QUESTION, WHETHER A MAN MAY MARRY HIS DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER?

1. A brief enquiry into the lawfulness of marrying a deceased wife's sister. Christian's Magazine, vol. iv. p. 80 and 130.
2. A dissertation on the marriage of a man with his sister-in-law. By John H. Livingston. pp. 179. 1816.
3. The doctrine of incest stated, and the question considered, whether a man may marry a deceased wife's sister? By Domesticus. pp. 47. 1826.

We have placed the titles of these essays at the head of this article, not because we intend to give what may properly be called a review of any or all of them, but because we propose to extract from their pages a brief statement of the argument from scripture and from reason against a man's marrying the sister of his deceased wife. This is a question, especially in the present agitated state of some parts of the American Church respecting it, unquestionably of great importance. The law on this subject is so clear, that it does indeed seem strange how it ever should become a question with those who profess to take the scriptures for their guide. We believe it has been reserved for the Churches in America to present such a spectacle to the world. The conclusion from the scriptures against the practice which it is proposed to legalize, lies so near the premises, and the reasoning from the one to the other is so short and obvious that we should think it impossible to hesitate or to err. And this is doubtless the reason why, with a unanimity impossible on a subject of doubtful disputation, it has been condemned by the whole of Christendom, down to this very day. In a body of evidence collected by Dr. Livingston, in the 10th section of his dissertation, he has shown that in the early part of the Christian dispensation, marriage with a deceased wife's sister was, by several Ecclesiastical Councils, included within the prohibited degrees. And that therefore such marriages were considered incestuous, and those contracting them liable to the penalties provided for such offences. The fa-

thers of the Greek and Latin Churches expressed decidedly the same opinion. The Church of Rome, "corrupt as she is in doctrine and worship, acknowledged the universal obligation and extent of the Levitical law respecting incest." "Among all the Reformers there was not a dissenting voice. They were explicit and unanimous upon the subject." "And all the Protestant Churches have uniformly and unequivocally maintained the same doctrine," and continue to maintain it both in Europe and America. Now whence this decisive, this uniform, this universal and unanimous judgment? Can it be accounted for upon any principle or any supposition, but the clearness of the law contained in the scriptures, and the indubitable evidence of its binding obligation upon us? Of this however we must judge for ourselves, that our faith may not rest on the wisdom of men, but on the word of God.

The law concerning incest, by which the lawfulness or unlawfulness of the marriage in question must be tried, is contained in Leviticus xviii. 6—17, and xx. 19—21. Before examining this law, the following remarks are offered concerning the Levitical law in general. In the first place, this law is given as to men of honest and upright minds, whose duty it is earnestly to seek after and obey the truth, and not to evade or oppose it. It is an easy thing by quibbling and disputing, to perplex and obscure the plainest matters. The law of God is not given to be so treated, but like other parts of divine truth, to be received in the love of it, and therefore is given in brief but plain declarations. There are no needless repetitions: yet all is so clear, that he who honestly seeks for direction cannot fail to obtain it. Another observation is, that all the laws laid down in the Levitical code are referable to three distinct heads, or are suited to Israel, to whom they were immediately given, considered in three different aspects. These are so different from each other, that there is no danger of confounding them, nor any difficulty in ascertaining what laws relate to one, or what to another; and probably for this reason no particular order is observed in the delivering of them. 1st. Israel is viewed in the Levitical law as a society of rational beings, of moral agents accountable to God and under his moral government. In this point of view they are on a level with the rest of mankind, and owe to God certain duties, as their creator, lawgiver and judge. These God lays down in different parts of the Levitical code; and it is evident that these are binding not on Israel only, but on all who stand in the same relation to God, that is, on the whole human race. These are denominated moral duties, and are partly natural, necessarily

arising out of the relation between God and his rational creatures and cannot be dispensed with, and partly positive, depending for their binding obligation on the sovereign will of God revealed to us. Of the former kind, is the command, "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me." of the latter, the clause in the fourth commandment, which enjoins, "Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work, but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." &c.—of this kind also, is the law respecting incest, as shall be afterwards shewn. All these laws, whether natural or positive, are universally and constantly binding wherever they have been revealed. Respecting them, Christ says, "I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfill it.—One jot cannot pass from this law,—and whosoever shall break one of these least commandments and *shall teach men so*, shall be called least in the kingdom of God." "Faith" or the gospel, "then, does not make void the law, yea it establishes it." Another branch of the Levitical code is that which respects Israel as a church, under a particular dispensation, and gives directions concerning the modes and ceremonies of her worship. This was purposely designed by God to be a yoke of bondage, all leading the worshipper forward to Christ as to come in the flesh. All this was ceremonial—was binding on the church of Israel only—and was to be abolished when the end for which it was instituted was gained. And this was done in the coming of Christ, and the establishment of a new dispensation. The priesthood being now changed, there must of necessity be a change of the law. Every thing, therefore, in the Levitical code, which refers to this head or is necessarily connected with it, is abrogated by God himself, and is no longer of binding obligation on any. A third class of laws included in the Levitical code, embraces those which relate to Israel as a nation separated from other nations for a special purpose, and having God himself for their king. Some of these, requiring truth and justice between man and man, were founded in the moral law, and are still universally binding. Others were peculiar to Israel under a Theocracy, for a special purpose, and partly of a typical character. Such are the laws respecting the division and preservation and redemption of their inheritances, the Sabbatical year and the year of jubilee, and the like; all of which, are necessarily ended with the coming of the Shiloh, to which event they had a special reference.

A third and the last observation we shall make respecting the Levitical law is, that it is uniformly addressed to the male sex, but yet the female in like circumstances is included. This is a principle important in the present question, but greatly overlook-

ad. The truth of the observation is obvious by inspection. The current language of scripture is, "Thus shalt thou say to the children (Heb "the sons") of Israel. And afterwards it is said to Israel, that it was the law which God commanded their *fathers*, and they acknowledge them as the commandments and statutes and judgments which he commanded our *fathers*, &c. 1 Kings viii. 58. See also Deut. vi. 1, 2. Should any doubt whether the females are included in these laws, where the males are immediately addressed, he has only to look into the following, and similar passages, Deut. v. 2, 3. xxix. 10—12. When therefore a command is given in this manner, it is not by inference that we affirm the female is bound by it as well as the male: it is the direct and intended meaning of the law. As when it is said, thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house, it is no less binding on the one sex than on the other; and for the same reason, when it is added, "nor thy neighbour's wife," it carries in it the same precept to the female, as if it had been said, "nor thy neighbour's husband." In like manner in the law of incest, Lev. xviii. when it is said, verse 6th, thou shalt not approach unto (that is thou shalt not marry) any that is near of kin to thee, both sexes, according to the principle above stated, are included. And when it is added to the one, verse 16, thou shalt not marry thy brother's wife, it carries in it the same precept to the female as if it had been said, "thou shalt not marry thy sister's husband;" implying of course a prohibition to the man to marry the sister of his wife. Such is the plain and (not inferential, but) direct testimony of the divine law. To deny this, would be to set aside the binding obligation of every precept of the moral law on the one-half, viz. the female part, of the human race. The law of the ten commandments, and that in the 18th and 20th of Leviticus, is addressed to the very same assembly, the manner of address is the same; and if the female is included in and directly addressed in the one case, she must be so in the other. Or else let the contrary be shewn. And if she is concerned in the general prohibition, "not to marry any that is near of kin," she is equally so with the male in the succeeding specified prohibited degrees included in the general precept; that is, in whatever degree of kindred, whether by consanguinity or affinity, marriage is forbidden to the one sex, it is forbidden to the other also; and the command is as direct and positive to the one as to the other. We are persuaded it is for want of attending to this obvious and necessary principle that even a doubt could have arisen on this plain subject, and that some who strenuously condemn such marriages as contrary to the law of God, yet concede that

they are not *expressly* condemned by it, but only *indirectly*, and by *inference*. This principle is not particularly laid down, but rather taken for granted in the following argument, which we collect from the excellent papers in the Christian's Magazine.

"The law of marriage is positive. No general principle can, of itself, establish, with a binding force upon the conscience, the doctrine, that 'the conjugal union is, in all cases, to subsist between one man and one woman only; and, with the exception of conjugal infidelity, is to last during the joint lives of the parties.' Nothing but a divine *institution* could subject them to this condition: nothing but a divine *revelation* communicated the knowledge of it.

Again: There is no general principle; no reason from the nature of things; nothing but such an institution, so revealed, which can limit the right of contracting marriage with respect to the *degrees of kindred*. The marriages which immediately succeeded that of the first pair, were evidently between brothers and sisters. Unless parents had married their children, it could not be otherwise, without the creation of different races. And these marriages of brothers with sisters were *lawful*. God, the holy and the just, could not, by his own act, lay upon men a physical necessity of sinning against him. But that which is lawful in itself cannot become unlawful without the intervention of the legislative power; i. e. in the case before us, without the intervention of God himself by a positive statute. The conclusion is, either that there are no restrictions of marriage at all in the article of kindred, or that they are to be sought for in the scriptures. The first branch of the alternative will hardly be embraced by any sober-minded Christian. Our inquiries are, therefore, confined to the second; that is, to the question of fact, viz. *What has God determined in his word?*

On this point the New Testament implies much, but has nothing formal. We must, then, go back to the Old Testament, or else adopt the branch of the alternative which we have just rejected, viz. that there are no restrictions at all.

The most explicit regulations are in the 18th chapter of the book of Leviticus; out of which two questions arise.

1. Is the law of marriage therein prescribed binding upon us? So that the degrees forbidden to the Jews are equally forbidden to all mankind?

2. Supposing this law to be thus universal and permanent, does it include and forbid the marriage of a deceased wife's sister?

Materials for a right decision of both seem to be within a very narrow compass. With regard to the former, I remark,

1st. If the restrictions in the 18th of Leviticus are no part of moral law *now*: if they are not of universal and permanent obligation, there is no written law, no divine statute, upon the subject. Consequently, a man is at liberty to marry his sister, his mother, or his daughter; and the converse. This, I believe, would shock all christian feeling and conscience. Incest, be it remembered, is not a crime against nature, or natural law. It is a crime against *positive* law, and against positive law *only*. If you discard the law of marriage, as laid down in Levit. 18; and yet contend that there is such a thing as *incest at all*, let the law which it violates be produced.

2d. Immediately subjoined to the specification of degrees within which marriage might not be contracted, are the following injunction and reason:—‘ Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things: for in all these things the nations are defiled which I cast out before you, and the land is defiled; *therefore do I visit the iniquity thereof upon it*, and the land itself vomiteth out her inhabitants.’ Lev. 18. ver. 24, 25.

But the Canaanites never were under the law of Moses; therefore their sin must have been committed against a law prior to, and more general than, the Mosaic dispensation: the righteous God never makes *ex post facto* laws. Now, what law could equally bind the seed of Canaan and the seed of Abraham; the Hittite and the Hebrew; the people who were within, and the people who were without, the covenant of peculiarity,—equally bind them in a matter in which *all mankind have a common interest*, and will continue to have it so long as there shall be male and female, but a law which binds men universally? It is only because the law reached to the whole human family, that it embraced the inhabitants of Canaan.

In discussing the case of the incestuous man at Corinth, Paul assumes, as a fact not to be disputed, the continuance of the old restrictions. Had they been abolished, it would have been no more “fornication,” for one to marry his *father’s widow*, than to marry any other unbetrothed woman. Had it been adultery, the crime would have been no more heinous, than his cohabiting with any other married woman. Yet Paul lays heavy stress upon this circumstance, that she had been his *father’s wife*. A circumstance of no weight at all, unless the divine law concerning prohibited degrees was in force. *There* such a connexion is expressly forbidden. But you must take the *whole law together*.—You may not pick out *one* or *two* of its provisions, at your pleasure or your convenience, and throw aside the rest. Unless you can show a dispensation from the lawgiver, *every* part of the law

is binding, for the same reason which renders *any* part of it binding; as the divine authority equally pervades *all* its parts.

In the course of his remarks, Paul observes, that having “*a father’s wife,*” is a species of uncleanness, which was not “so much as *named* among the Gentiles.” I need not prove that this is a scriptural form of speech expressing the utmost detestation, as in Ephes. v. 3. “Fornication, and all uncleanness, and covetousness, let it not be once *named* among you, as becometh saints.” It is obvious, on the face of the argument, that Paul *approves* of this feeling among the Gentiles. Now, how came the Gentiles by it? and why did the apostle approve it? If it had not been right, he had not honoured it with his apostolic sanction. Right it could not be, unless conformable to the divine law. The case was a case of *incest*: the Gentiles abhorred it; the apostle commends them; but there could have been no place either for their abhorrence, or for his commendation, unless the marriage in question were contrary to the law of God. Not merely the Mosaic law, surely! That law was now fulfilled, and its peculiarities were gone. It never bound the Gentiles: yet incest is abhorred by them. But what creates incest? The divine law. Unquestionably then, *that*, for the neglect of which God punished the Heathen *before* the law of Moses; *that*, which was confirmed by the Mosaic law; *that*, which obligated nations who knew not the rites of Moses; *that*, which the apostle, under plenary inspiration, damns with his reprobation after their decease, belongs to a law which is, and must be, of unalterable obligation. There is no escaping from this conclusion, without maintaining that Paul decided wrong; in other words, that the Holy Ghost committed a blunder.

Let us proceed to the

2d Question. “Is the marriage of a deceased wife’s sister really forbidden by the law of which I have just proved the universality and perpetuity?”

The general principle of interpretation is thus laid down in the law itself. “None of you shall approach to any that is *near of kin to him*, to uncover their nakedness.” Lev. xviii. 6. The rule, then, by which we are to apply all the specifications of this law, is the *degree of kindred*. Accordingly, the prohibitions are not punctually reciprocated; but the prohibition of a certain degree to one sex, is, of course, a prohibition to the other sex also. If, as in verse 8, a man may not marry his father’s wife, it follows directly, that a woman may not marry her mother’s husband; the degree of kindred being the same. With this rule of interpretation we go to verse 16, where is the following statute: “Thou

shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy *brother's wife*; it is thy *brother's nakedness*." As the law is treating not of *adultery*, but of *incest*, it must mean not the wife of a living, but of a deceased, brother. The prohibition, therefore, is, that a woman shall not marry her brother-in-law: in other words, that *two brothers shall not marry the same woman*. Now, as the prohibition relates to the *degree of kindred*; and as the sister of a deceased wife stands in the very same relation with the brother of a deceased husband, the law is express and full, that *two sisters shall not marry the same man*. Therefore, whoever marries his deceased wife's sister is, by the clear and unequivocal sentence of God's law, guilty of *incest*. There is no evading this construction but by distinctions which would destroy the law altogether."

This is, perhaps, the proper place to notice the only objections worthy of notice which have been hinted against the doctrine thus established, though we believe they are now given up as untenable by the ablest advocates of the practice we condemn. Of these, there are only two; the one is drawn from the 18th verse of the same xviiith chapter, and is thus proposed. "Since a man may not take a wife to her sister to vex her beside the other in her life time, it seems to be implied that he may marry the sister of his wife after her death." But let us see to what such objections, if indulged in, would lead us. If the expression, "a wife to her sister," mean a wife's sister, then it might at least with equal fairness be inferred, that "it is only a woman's *sister* whom a man may not marry during the life of his wife," and that of course he may marry any other, which would make the law a direct permission of polygamy, which the verse itself directly forbids.— "But, besides, the whole of this objection is founded upon a mistake. However our translation sounds, there is not a syllable in the passage about marrying a wife's sister, more than about marrying any other woman. The expressions, "a woman to her sister," and "a man to his brother," are Hebraisms of exactly the same import with "one to another." For example: In the treaty with Abimelech and Isaac, our English version has it, "they sware *one to another*." Gen. xxvi. 31. In the original it is, "they sware, *a man to his brother*." In the account given by Moses of the structure of the tabernacle, an order relative to the curtains runs thus: "the five curtains shall be coupled together, *one to another*." Exod. xxvi. 3. The original is, "*a woman to her sister*." The phrase is exactly the same in the passage in Leviticus, and ought to have been rendered in the same manner; viz. "Neither shalt thou take one woman to another," (or one wife to another,) "to vex her beside the other in her life time." The text has no

thing to do with the marriage of a wife's sister. It is a clear, simple, and absolute prohibition of polygamy; and it is the only one in the Mosaic law. The inference drawn from it in favour of such a marriage, rests upon a blunder growing out of the *sound of two words in a version,*" which is faulty only in translating the idiom of one language word for word into another.

The other objection is founded upon the statute in Deut. xxv. 5. and is to this effect. "If it is lawful in this case for a man to marry his brother's wife, it is equally lawful for a woman to marry her sister's husband." Who so blind as to be misled by a sophism like this? Let it be put in due form, thus: It is lawful for a man, *in a certain case*, to marry his brother's wife; therefore, it is lawful for him to do so, *in all cases*; and likewise, for the woman in all cases, to marry her sister's husband. Every person must see that neither the first nor the last part of this conclusion is contained in the premises, and both must therefore be false.—Were this conclusion just, it would be a repeal of the law in Leviticus, xviii. 16. being directly contrary to its very letter, and yet Israel is placed by God under both at the same time; that is, a man may, and may not marry his brother's wife. The truth is, "as this statute in Deuteronomy interferes, to a certain extent, with the statute on the same subject in Leviticus, it can be viewed only as a *particular exception to a general rule*. The rule itself, instead of being invalidated, is confirmed, by the exception; and must take its course in all cases not expressly excepted."—God here, for a special object, peculiar to the state of Israel in the promised land, and which was necessary for attaining the end for which they were placed in it, makes a solitary, well-defined exception, to his own positive institution. This object is now gained, and the exception of course must cease. Israel no longer exists as a body politic, they have no longer inheritances of land in Canaan; the distinction of families and the keeping up of a name and family, is of no further use, and is utterly impossible: the circumstances, therefore, which required a man to marry his brother's wife, can never exist again, and consequently the original law, is now as really without an exception, as if never any had existed. This exception, however, went further than making it lawful for a man to marry his brother's wife, in a certain case, it commanded and obliged him to do it. We have not heard of any pleading the benefit of the statute to this extent, yet consistency would seem to require even this. Some, however, reason in another way from this statute, and say that it is a proof that a man's marrying his brother's wife, (and of course a woman's marrying her sister's husband,) is not in itself sinful, for if

it were, God would never have permitted it, far less commanded it in any case. This may be freely admitted without injury to our cause, for though God can never command that which is in itself immoral, yet when he forbids that which he has a right to forbid, who will say that it is not immoral to disregard his prohibition? To do that which God has forbidden, even though it may have been lawful before such prohibition, and may be permitted again by God if he choose, is nothing less than rebellion against the God of heaven. Even if this were not self-evident, the fate of Uzzah, of the men of Bethshemesh, of Korah and his company, and of our first parents in paradise, are warning monuments to every future age. As these objections then, are clearly of no weight, "my conclusion on the whole argument is, that the marriage of a deceased wife's sister, is unequivocally *incestuous*; cannot become lawful by any act of man, and is one of those crimes which infallibly brings down the judgments of God upon the nation which tolerates them."

(To be concluded in our next.)

Selections.

To the Editor of the Christian Advocate.

[In the last letter on the Atonement, page 425, the word DISTRIBUTIVE was not intended to be used in the heading of the third particular. It should have read: "On the plan of the New School, the JUSTICE OF GOD HAS NOT BEEN SATISFIED, nor can there be ANY DISPLAY of this attribute in the death of Christ." You will observe, from the illustration and proof, that it was the author's design to show that neither *public*, nor *distributive* justice has received any satisfaction, on the principles of the New School.]

LETTERS ON THE ATONEMENT.—No. X.

The Love of God.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—

The theories of the two schools in relation to divine love, will be examined in this letter. I shall endeavour to prove that the doctrine of the Old School puts a HIGHER HONOUR on the LOVE of God manifested in the gift of his only Son, as our atoning sacrifice, than that of the New.

In holy scripture, this love is celebrated as the highest and most glorious display of love that was ever made. Accordingly, we contemplate it as that special love, which Jehovah was pleased to entertain for all whom he designed to bring to the enjoyment of everlasting happiness. We believe that, for the consistent and honourable exercise of this amazing and eternal love, and that it might flow out to them in its rich and exuberant blessings, he sent his own Son to be a propitiation for their sins.

"Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that God loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." 1 John, iv. 10. We believe that, if Jehovah had not conceived this love for his chosen, which prompted him to effect their salvation, he certainly would not have exposed his co-equal Son to shame and suffering, nor permitted his precious blood to be shed by impious men.

But as the New School believe that the death of Christ merely opened the door of mercy for all men, they can attribute the atonement to no higher source than the general benevolence and good will of God. "It is," says the writer of Dialogues on Atonement, "the love of benevolence or good will. This has for its object all creatures capable of enjoyment or suffering; and regards the happiness of each one according to its real worth. Now the happiness of an individual is not, in itself, any more valuable, if he is elected, than if he is not elected. But God regards things according to their real worth. His regard for the happiness of the *non-elect*, therefore, is the same as for that of the elect." "When this kind of love is exercised towards the guilty, it is called compassion."—"Finally, it is this compassion for sinners, which is expressed by the Father, in giving his Son to die; and by the Son, in laying down his life. And this is the plain import of the text before mentioned, "God so loved the *world*, that he sent his only begotten Son." Again: "It is evident, therefore, that God felt *no special love* for the elect, no love of a *different kind*, from that which he felt for the non-elect. He loved one as much as he did the other: and in the exercise of that love for all he gave his Son to die for all." Now here it is asserted that Jehovah loved the non-elect, as *much* as he loved the elect; and that the compassion which he feels for the guilty of every description, is the spring of that astonishing gift which fills heaven and earth with holy wonder and delight; and, consequently, it follows that the compassion which the divine bosom feels for the wretch on whom sentence of eternal perdition is pronounced, or the compassion felt for the damned, who are "creatures capable of suffering," gave birth to that stupendous gift, which we are constantly taught by inspired writers to regard as a demonstration of God's ineffable love to his church.

These are new views for men professing to belong to the Calvinistic school. They may be found in the writings of Arminians; but it is only of recent date, that they have been transferred to the pages of the advocates of the doctrines of particular election and limited salvation. Let us see whether they will bear the test of examination.

Israel was a tpye of God's chosen people; and if this representation be correct, then the descendants of Abraham, considered as an *elect people*, were not distinguished from other nations by any peculiar affection of the Most High toward them. Such, however, were not the views of their inspired lawgiver, who celebrates the special love of God to them as his elect people: "The Lord thy God hath *chosen thee* to be a special people unto himself, above all the people that are upon the face of the earth. The Lord did not *set his love* upon you, nor *choose you*, because ye were more in number than any people; for ye were the fewest of all people: but because the Lord loved you." Deut. vii. 6—8. "Behold, the heaven, and the heaven of heavens, is the Lord's, thy God; the earth also, with all that therein is. Only the Lord had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and he chose their seed after them, even you, above all people, as it is this day." Deut. x. 14, 15. By these texts we are plainly taught that the children of Israel were the objects of Jehovah's *special love*; that this love was not founded on any *good qualifications* which they possessed, but originated in his *sovereign pleasure*; and that the love which God bare to them he did not bear to nations whom he had not chosen. Equally adverse to the representation of this writer, is the testimony of Paul; who expressly teaches us, that Jacob, as an *elected person*, was distinguished by a love which was denied to his brother Esau. "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the *purpose* of God, according to *election*, might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth; it was said, The elder shall serve the younger. As it is written, *Jacob have I LOVED, but Esau have I hated.*" Whatever explanation may be given of the election which the apostle here speaks of, it cannot be denied that he exhibits Jacob as an *elect person*, and Esau as a *non-elect person*; that he represents Jacob as distinguished by a love which was not extended to Esau; and that this love was not grounded on the superior worth of the younger brother, but issued from the sovereign purpose of an infinitely wise God—Here we have an exact type of the love which the Almighty bears to his spiritual church. She was, in the exercise of his sovereign pleasure, chosen out of the common mass of guilt and pollution. She was distinguished from the rest of mankind by a *special love*, not on account of the good qualifications, or personal righteousness of her members, but because the Lord had a delight to love her; and from this love flowed the astonishing gift of the Son of God to be our Redeemer. In accordance with this representation, the apostle speaks of the love of Christ to his church: "Husbands

love your wives, even as *Christ* also *loved the church*, and *gave* himself for it, *that he might sanctify and cleanse* it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." The love which a man bears to his wife is unquestionably peculiar; such a love as he may not indulge to any other woman. Still more peculiar is that love which the Saviour entertains for his church; a love which he does not bear to others. Now, to this special wonderful love, the apostle traces up the gift which Christ made of himself, and all the blessings of pardon, justification, sanctification, and glorification, which were purchased by his precious blood.

In proof that the death or atonement of Christ, took its rise from the general benevolence of God, that common love in which the reprobate share equally with the elect, an appeal is made to the declaration of our Lord to Nicodemus: "God so loved the *world* that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John, iii. 16. For a moment let us grant—that the term *world*, in this text, means all mankind, and mark the consequences. What is the proof of God's love to the world? The gift of his only begotten Son. For what purpose was he given? "*That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.*" It was his fixed and unalterable purpose, that all believers should be saved. Now, if in this verse the term *world* means all mankind, it must, in the next verse, be equally extensive in its signification; and then it will follow, that it was the first and unalterable purpose of God in sending his Son into the world, that all mankind should be saved; for the form of the expressions, you will observe, in the two verses, especially in the original, denoting the *divine intention*, is the *same*: "*that the world might be saved.*" Here is universal salvation! But from such a conclusion our brethren turn away, because they know it to be unscriptural. The conclusion, however, must follow, unless we qualify the expression in the last verse, and show that the term *world* cannot there mean all mankind, but only such of them as shall believe. In the context, then, we find a reason for limiting a word, which very rarely in scripture signifies *all and every man*. This term was wisely selected by our Saviour, in preference to the term *elect*. 1. Because the *elect*, until called and converted, form a part of the *world* that lies in wickedness. 2. Because the Redeemer intended to correct the prejudices of Nicodemus, and enlarge his views of the benefits to be derived from the coming

of the Messiah. With the rest of his countrymen, he supposed they were to be confined to his own nation. But our Saviour teaches him that they were to be far more extensive in their distribution, by informing him that the love of God, which sent his Son to save sinners, embraced the *Gentiles* as well as the Jews. It was confined not to one nation, but extended to all nations. It was a love which he bore to the world at large, because every where the objects of it were to be found, mingled with every tongue, and people, and nation. John has himself explained the import of the text, in chap. xi. 51, 52. "And this spake he, not of himself: but being high-priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; and not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one *the children of God that were scattered abroad.*"

If God love all mankind alike, and Jesus died alike for all, why does he not intercede for the salvation of all mankind? That he does not intercede for the salvation of all, he himself has assured us: "*I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me.*" Now, can it be doubted that he loves those of our fallen race for whom he intercedes, more than those for whom he does not intercede? Indeed, the special love of God to his elect, will clearly follow from an admission of our brethren, to which I have more than once adverted. "Christ, say they, did not die with an *intention* of saving any but the elect. The Father did not deliver up his son to death with an intention of saving any other of the human family." The most, then, that can be said, in conformity with their views, is, that Christ designed by his death to make it consistent to offer salvation to the non-elect, and place them under a dispensation of mercy. Here, then, is a vast difference made between these two classes of our fallen race. For the one Christ dies with an *intention to save them*; for the other, he dies with *no such intention*. The one, Jehovah chooses to salvation in Christ; the other, he does not thus choose. To the one, he not only offers salvation in the preaching of the gospel, but, by working faith in their hearts, and thus uniting them to the Lord Jesus Christ, he actually puts them in possession of its rich and invaluable blessings. To the other, the offer of salvation is sincerely made, and they are inexcusable in rejecting it; but God does not impart to them the saving grace of his Holy Spirit.

And is it reasonable to conclude, that Jehovah feels for those two classes of men, whom he treats so differently, the same *kind* and the same *degree of love*?

Was it not easily seen, from the peculiar endearments which Jacob showed to his son Joseph, that he loved him more than his brethren? And is it not manifest that Jehovah loves those on whom he bestows peculiar and distinguishing blessings, more than he loves those on whom he does not bestow them? When the Jews saw Jesus weeping at the tomb of Lazarus, they justly remarked, "Behold how he loved him!" They judged of the strength of his love from its effects; and doubtless we are authorized to judge of the love of God, by the same criterion. When the God of Israel sets forth his peculiar love to his ancient people, he enumerates some of the distinguishing blessings bestowed on them: and if the enjoyment of superior external blessings was a proof of distinguishing regard for the people thus favoured, then surely the enjoyment of spiritual blessings, must be a proof of distinguishing love toward that portion of our race whom Jehovah delights thus to favour. "Behold," exclaims the apostle in view of these distinguishing blessings, "*behold what manner of love* the Father hath bestowed on us, that we should be called the sons of God!" And again: "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that God loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins."

To this *special*, this *distinguishing* love, we attribute the gift of Jesus Christ; and not, as our brethren, to that common love, that general compassion, which, as they say, will be felt even for the damned, when the sentence of everlasting perdition shall be pronounced on them. This general compassion differs widely from that astonishing love which inspired writers celebrate in such lofty notes of praise;—that wonderful love which constitutes the theme of that everlasting song which will be sung by saints and angels in heaven, through endless ages. With inspired writers, and in unison with the sentiments of saints around the throne in glory, we magnify this love, and set it above all displays of general benevolence, that were ever made in creation or in providence. It has dimensions, a breadth and length, and depth and height, which no created intellect will ever be able fully to comprehend. "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever." Amen.

Yours, sincerely.

REMARKS

On an Article in THE EDINBURGH REVIEW, in which the Doctrine of Hume on Miracles is maintained: By the Rev. James Somerville, Minister of Drumelzier.

Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools. ST. PAUL.

(Concluded from page 436.)

SECTION II.

Examination of the Reasoning of the Reviewer.

The passages in the Review on which it is intended to animadvert, are as follows:—"The first author we believe who stated fairly the connection betwixt the evidence of testimony, and the evidence of experience, was Hume, in his *Essay on Miracles*; a work full of deep thought and enlarged views: and if we do not stretch the principles so far as to interfere with the truths of religion, abounding in maxims of great use in the conduct of life, as well as in the speculations of philosophy." P. 329.

"Conformably to the principles contained in it, and also to those in the *Essay* before us, if we would form some general rules for comparing the evidence derived from our experience of the course of nature, with the evidence of testimony, we may consider physical phenomena as divided into two classes, the one comprehending all those of which the course is known, *from experience*, to be *perfectly aniform*; and the other comprehending those of which the course, though no doubt governed by general laws, is not perfectly conformable to any law with which we are acquainted. The violation of the order of nature among phenomena of the former class, the suspension of gravity, for example, the deviation of any of the stars from their places, or their courses in the heavens, &c.; these are facts, the improbability of which is so strong, that *no testimony* can prevail against it. It will always be more wonderful that the violation of such order should take place, than that any number of witnesses should be deceived themselves, or be disposed to deceive others."

"Against the uniformity of such laws (as the motions of the heavenly bodies, &c.) it is impossible for testimony to prevail." P. 330.

"Supposing the greatest antiquity to which history goes back is 5000 years, or 1,826,213 days, the probability that the sun will rise to-morrow is, according to this rule, $\frac{1,826,214}{1,826,215}$, or there is, 1,826,214 to 1, to wager in favour of that event." p. 333.

One of the most common sophisms, is the substituting of one term in the place of another, which are totally different in their

meaning, and then arguing from them as if they meant the same thing. Of this the Reviewer is glaringly guilty in his reasoning, as contained in these extracts. He calls that experience, which really is, and ought to have been called, testimony; and then he argues from it against testimony. Thus he asserts, that our knowledge of the great laws of nature, such as the rising and setting of the sun, gravity, &c. is founded on *uniform experience*. Now this is not the fact. The word experience can, with no propriety, be applied to any thing except what falls under the personal observation of an individual. The knowledge that any person has of the regular rising and setting of the sun, from experience, is exactly commensurate with his own life, or rather with that part of it, in which he has been able to make observations. With regard to all the time that elapsed before, he has no experience; if he knows any thing about it, he knows it solely by testimony. It might be experience with each of the successive generations which preceded the present one, but it comes to the present generation only in the shape of testimony, and must therefore be subjected to all the rules by which testimony is usually tried. Supposing history to reach back 5000 years, all the experience that exists in the world of the regular rising and setting of the sun, is only the experience of the oldest men who are alive, and the remainder of the 5000 years depends entirely on testimony.

If it was owing to the want of acumen that the Reviewer did not perceive this confusion of ideas and terms, he must be placed very low in the class of reasoners. If he did perceive it, but adhered to it, because he easily saw that the distinction would overthrow all his reasoning, he must stand still lower as a man of integrity. Had he confined himself to the just sense of the word experience, his argument would have been, "No testimony can prevail against 70 or 80 years experience." But such a conclusion would have little answered the purpose, which either Hume or he had in view.

That the Reviewer has made this unwarranted use of the word experience, where testimony should have been used, will appear plain from the way in which the word is daily used in other cases. There are at present many discoveries making in chemistry. Would the Reviewer think himself warranted to say that he knew the truth of these by experience, if in fact he had never seen one of the experiments? We hear much of meteoric stones: —Would any man who understood language, say he had experience of stones falling from the air, who had never seen one of them? Equally false is it to say, that it is from uniform ex-

perience we know the rising and setting of the sun from the remotest times to the present day.

But if they are determined to call that by the name of experience, which comes to us by the testimony of persons who lived before our days, then they must in justice apply the same word to that testimony which has transmitted miracles to us. If it is by experience we know the rising and setting of the sun from the beginning of the world, it is also by experience we know that in the days of Joshua the sun did not set for a whole day, that in the days of Moses the Red Sea was divided, and many other facts of the same kind. The ordinary facts which happened in those times, and these extraordinary ones, come to us precisely in the same way, by the testimony of persons who declare that they were founded upon their personal experience. We must therefore give them all one denomination; either call them all experience, or call them all testimony; and whichever of the terms we adopt, *uniformity* is excluded, by the very fact of the record which is in our hands testifying to the deviations.

The Reviewer, after Hume and La Place having falsely assumed, that all our knowledge of the great laws of nature is *experience*, and also that experience is *perfectly uniform*, goes on to state that *no testimony* can prevail against it. A most unquestionable truth, without doubt, if his premises are granted, and far from requiring the metaphysical talents of Hume, or the mathematical powers of La Place or of his Review to establish. For, if experience be uniform, that experience must consist of the personal experience of every individual of the human race in every age. Nothing less can constitute uniform experience; and if there be uniform experience on any point whatever, it is plain that no testimony can prevail against it, for this obvious reason, that no person could possibly be found giving such testimony. The uniformity of experience, which is assumed as the very basis of the argument, precludes the possibility of any opposite testimony. The proposition, therefore, which assumes that no testimony can prevail against perfect uniformity of experience, is a mere childish truism. It first of all assumes, that experience is perfectly uniform, and then argues, that if it is perfectly uniform, it must be perfectly uniform!

But if it be true that a very small part of our knowledge of the laws of nature is founded on experience; that the far greater part of it depends on testimony; and that these gentlemen, by a dexterous manœuver, have substituted experience for testimony,—we must restore this word to its proper station, and then try their reasoning according to this view of the case. They

ought then to have said, that *uniform testimony*, for 5000 years, or deducting the life of the present generation, which is justly placed under the head of experience, for about 4920 years, bore, that the sun had risen and set every day; and then their argument would have been, that *no testimony* can prevail against *uniform testimony*,—just such a precious truism as we had in the former case. For if the testimony be uniform, where are the persons to be found to testify the deviations; and if there be any persons testifying the deviations, where is the uniformity of testimony?

This will lead the reader to see why they have substituted experience for testimony. Real experience furnished too narrow ground for such an extensive conclusion as they wished to draw. Had they restricted the term experience to what is really experience, and called all the rest testimony, they would have been deprived of the plausible ground of opposing testimony to uniform experience; and instead of saying that no testimony is to be credited against uniform experience, they would have been obliged to say, that no testimony is to be credited against uniform testimony;—a proposition too trifling and harmless to meet with any attention. Had they called that part of our knowledge testimony which really is testimony, then it would have followed, that the facts concerning the ordinary laws of nature, and the facts concerning miracles, as all standing on the same ground, the ground of testimony, must all be tried by the same laws, the laws by which testimony is tried.

Let them then confine the term experience to what is experience, and testimony to what is testimony, and they must either say, 1st, That no testimony is to be credited against a man's personal experience; or, 2dly, That no testimony can prevail against uniform testimony. If they adopt the first, it will destroy all historical evidence, and all credibility of facts, except the few which have fallen under an individual's personal observation. If the second, it is such a childish truism, as to be perfectly harmless, though the reasoning were allowed to be just; but it assumes what is not true, for testimony is not uniform with regard to the great laws of nature. The testimony which attests the existence of miracles, whether that testimony be true or false, at all events exists, and therefore destroys the uniformity of testimony on the other side.

These miracles, therefore, being thus attested, must be tried by the ordinary rules by which other testimony is tried. There actually is testimony for them: if there be any against them, let it be brought forward, and fairly weighed; but let them not be

rejected by the sweeping assertion, that uniform testimony is against them, an assertion evidently false: nor by the more plausible assertion, that uniform experience is against them, which can mean no more than that no man living has had experience of them,—a point which may readily be granted without the smallest injury to miracles, unless we are prepared to involve in one common destruction our belief of every fact which is beyond our personal observation.

I argue, therefore, against Hume, La Place, and the Reviewer, that no argument can be brought against miracles from uniform experience of the regularity of the great laws of nature, because no such uniform experience exists, if by experience we understand, as they do, the knowledge that is conveyed to us by all mankind in all ages.

If they give up the word *uniform*, and adopt the word *general* instead of it, and say that no testimony is to be credited against general experience and general testimony, this will as little serve them. This word, when deliberately adopted, supposes the want of uniformity, of universality; it supposes only a very large majority of cases to be regular, but it also supposes a number of deviations, otherwise the word *uniform* would be adopted. Now the granting of any cases of deviation, leaves all the room for miracles which can be desired.

They must therefore be compelled to give up the argument, or to say, *that no testimony is to be credited beyond our own observation*. I know not whether they will occupy this ground or not; but, as it is all that remains to them, it may be proper to shew that it is quite untenable.

If we are to believe nothing but what agrees with our personal observation and experience, it will reduce our knowledge and belief within very narrow limits indeed. The records of history would in a great measure be useless: the greatest part of the inhabitants of this island could never believe the existence of volcanoes, earthquakes, or any of those natural phenomena which have not fallen under their own observation. The course of nature, according to their experience, has been as uniform against these, as against the sun standing still, or a dead person rising to life. The inhabitants of those regions where ice is never seen, ought not to believe in its existence. The readers of Mr Locke have generally been disposed to smile at his account of the king of Siam, who hearkened with great deference to the narrative of the Dutch ambassador concerning the wonders of Europe, until he came to mention, that at one period of the year the rivers became so hard as to bear the heaviest carriages; but, on hearing this,

stopt him, and said he had hitherto believed him, because he appeared to be a sober man, but now he could believe him no longer. According to the principles of the Reviewer, he was perfectly right; and Mr Hume expressly says so. Nor do I mean entirely to deny it; for he had only a single witness testifying it; and, moreover, that witness was a traveller, and perhaps the Siamese prince knew, that in all ages travellers have had the same privilege to tell lies, as philosophers have had to maintain absurdities.* But on the principles of the Reviewer, he ought not to have believed that in this country the rivers freeze though a million of persons had gone from Europe to testify it—though he had found all these to be men of the most perfect integrity in every thing else—though they had offered to go to death, rather than deviate from their testimony—and though, in addition to this, he had become acquainted with all the European books which take notice of that circumstance. All should have weighed as nothing in opposition to his own unvarying experience of the course of nature. Yea, though he and all his countrymen, except one, had come here to see it, and had gone home and unanimously declared that it was true, still that one ought not to have believed it. In fact, the inhabitants of those regions ought on no account to believe this, unless either they come here to witness it, or some of our professors go there to exhibit their experiments concerning the formation of ice. Such, without the least straining, is the doctrine of the Reviewer. We may safely leave this to the common sense of mankind.

Perhaps the Reviewer will say, that the incredulity of these men would be unreasonable, because there is a wide difference betwixt their country and Europe; and as there is a degree of cold here which they have not experienced, so they could not know what might be the effects of that cold upon water. Very true. Neither has the Reviewer experienced the particular circumstances in which miracles were wrought, viz. when the divine authority of a particular religion was to be demonstrated; and, as he has no experience of these circumstances, he is not qualified to say what would take place under them.

The sum of this Section is this. We have no knowledge of past events from experience, but wholly from testimony;† testimony does not bear that the course of nature has been uniform, but ex-

* Cicero says, that in his days there was nothing so absurd which had not been maintained by some philosopher. Had he lived in the present times, he would not have been of a different opinion.

† Hume in a great measure acknowledges this in his letter to Dr Blair, printed in Dr Campbell's work on miracles

pressly bears that there have been many deviations. There is no other experience than an individual's personal observation; and to say that we ought to believe nothing but what agrees with our personal observation, leads to absurdity, and contradicts common sense.*

SECTION III.

Examination of the Reviewer continued.

The assertions which I intend to examine in this Section, are the following. "The suspension of gravity, the deviation of any of the stars from their places, &c. are facts, the improbability of which is so strong, that *no testimony* can prevail against it.—It will always be more wonderful, that the violation of such order should take place, than that any number of witnesses should be deceived themselves, or be disposed to deceive others."—"Against the uniformity of such laws, it is impossible for testimony to prevail."

We might safely have left the subject with what is said in the last Section; but as both Hume and the Reviewer repeat these assertions so often, and lay them down in such an unqualified manner, it may be useful to give them a little farther consideration.

I would first observe here, that the Reviewer has made a concession which appears to overthrow his whole argument. He computes that the probability of the sun rising to-morrow, is as $\frac{1826214}{1826215}$, or that a person may wager 1826214 to 1 in favour of it. This implies, that if a person should wager more, as, for instance, a hundred millions to one, he would act against the laws of probability. Here it is taken for granted, that there is some probability of the sun not rising to-morrow: it is very small, but still it is something. Now, I should be glad to know, by what mood or figure he will attempt to prove that an event which is not only possible, but to a certain degree probable, to-morrow, cannot by any evidence be established to have happened in any past period. If he say, that it is in itself impossible, we deny it upon his own showing, for he has proved that it is possible, and even to a certain degree probable. If he say, that uniform experience is against it, we deny it, and say that only the experience of the present generation is against it. If he say that uniform testimony is against it, this we deny also; for it is testified

* The Reviewer himself shews, that he does not make experience his rule of judging. In the very article we are examining, he labours to establish the belief of *meteoric stones*, though it is presumed he never saw any of them fall.

by the author of the book of Joshua, that in his days the sun stood still for a whole day; and there is no testimony at all on the other side, as applicable to that particular day. The same observations may be applied to all the miracles recorded in Scripture. Experience is not applicable to them, for it is limited to the objects under our notice; and testimony is so far from being against them, that there is testimony for them, and *none* against them. Many persons testify that they saw them happen, and none testify that they were upon the spot, and examined all the circumstances, and saw that they did not happen. As to the testimony of those who were not there, however uniform it might be, it does not bear at all upon the subject.

The principles of calculation, therefore, are more in support of miracles than against them. Hume's metaphysics would readily excite that suspicion of sophistry which naturally arises in every mind acquainted with metaphysical reasoning, taken in connection with his inveterate enmity to revelation. But when the first mathematicians of the age are seen coming forward in support of the same doctrines, it might be by many taken for granted, that now something of the certainty of geometrical demonstration had been introduced into the subject. But this is mere deception; for after all that La Place and the Reviewer have said, they have not been able to bring their own science to bear upon the subject in the slightest degree.

Perhaps the Reviewer will say, that the passage just now commented on, no doubt admits the possibility of the sun's standing still; but there is no inconsistency in granting this, and yet maintaining that no testimony ought to lead us to believe it. The fact is possible: we ought to believe if we saw it; but *no testimony* ought to induce us to believe it. If he argues in this manner, he argues fairly upon his own principles; and this will bring us directly to the subject of this Section,—Can *any* testimony be sufficient to lead us to believe such facts? It is no small matter that the possibility of such facts is granted; we have only now to inquire if any testimony can be to us a sufficient ground of belief. Instead of using abstract arguments, I shall here send the Reviewer to his master, Hume, and leave the reader to common sense; and we would wish it to be particularly observed, that in appealing so often to the sense of mankind, we place the whole matter before the tribunal which alone is competent to give a final decision. For, as was already observed, in remarking on La Place, mankind at large are the only judges of what they will or will not believe—what testimony is credible, and

what is incredible—what is sufficient to command their belief, and what not.

Mr. Hume says, “I own there may possibly be miracles, or violations of the usual course of nature, of such a kind as to admit of a proof from human testimony. Suppose all authors, in all languages, agree, that from the 1st of January, 1600, there was a total darkness over the whole earth for eight days; suppose that the tradition of this extraordinary event is still strong and lively among the people; that all travellers who return from foreign countries, bring us accounts of the same tradition, without the least variation or contradiction: it is evident, that our present philosophers, instead of doubting of that fact, ought to receive it for certain, and ought to search for the causes whence it might be derived.”*

Dr. Campbell, after quoting this passage, charges Hume strongly with inconsistency; and declares that he has given up the argument. “Was there ever,” says he, “a more glaring contradiction, than to declare, on the one hand, ‘*that no testimony for any kind of miracle can ever possibly amount to a probability, much less to a proof,*’ and yet supposing a case, *the testimony for which would amount not only to proof but to CERTAINTY?*”— Whether the Reviewer will agree with Mr. Hume in the above quotation, or not, I cannot tell. If he agrees with him, then he gives up the argument, and stands contradicted by himself. If he disagrees with him, he contradicts common sense.

Upon the supposition, that to preserve consistency, and maintain his principles, he disagrees with Hume, we shall put another case, though it is scarcely possible that a stronger one can be put than the one just now stated. Suppose that, fifty or sixty years ago, two hostile armies had been marching across this island; that they had come to Edinburgh, and marched to the sea-side; that, at the word of one of the generals, the sea had opened, and allowed his army to pass on dry ground; that, at his word, the waters had returned, and swept away the opposing army; that this fact had been testified by every individual of the surviving army, and by a hundred thousand spectators who had seen it

* The Reviewer has put a case, “that we would not believe the inhabitants of London, though they should tell us that the moon had not set there for 24 hours;” but this is a case not in point, and therefore a mere sophism: for the moon could not be actually above the horizon at London, without being equally so in every other place from which it was visible. Any testimony then to prove that it had been in such a position at London alone, would not be a testimony to prove an extraordinary fact or a miracle, but to prove a contradiction, that the same thing might be, and might not be, at the same time,—an assertion which could not be the subject of any proof, as an impossibility is not the object of any power. The above case from Hume is truly put; the Reviewer’s is quite sophistical.

from the neighbouring shores; and that it had been mentioned by all cotemporary writers;—upon the principles of the Reviewer, we ought not to believe it. Nay, though it had happened last year—though all the army which passed were still alive—though all the inhabitants of the surrounding countries were to come forward and declare that they saw it—yea, though all the fraternity of the Edinburgh Reviewers had seen it, except the writer of the article we are examining, who had happened not to be present, he could not have believed all this accumulation of evidence.

This is a very strong case, but we have a right to put the strongest possible case, because the assertion of Hume and of the Reviewer is most unqualified, “that no testimony can be a sufficient ground of belief in opposition to experience.” It is to no purpose to say, that none of the Scripture miracles are so strongly testified. These gentlemen are not attacking the testimony in favour of Scripture miracles, on account of its weakness; they declare that no testimony, be it ever so strong, could induce them to believe the reality of a miracle. We may leave it here to the common sense of the reader. Had such a miracle, and so attested, taken place, even Hume declares he would have believed it, provided it had been wrought on any other account than for the support of religion. If any person feels disinclined to believe a miracle so strongly proved, as supporting religion, it only shows that his hatred of religion is so great, as in that particular instance to have suspended the right exercise of his reason.

To render the above instance more striking, I have brought it very near our own times. But though our imagination is apt to impose on our judgment with regard to very distant facts, yet, if they were originally well attested, the distance of time makes no difference. On this point I shall give a quotation from the Reviewer, which will be considered of great value by those who are disposed to view him as hostile to revelation.

“It does not appear,” says he, “that the diminution of evidence is a necessary consequence of transmission from one age to another. It may hold in some instances; but in those which most commonly occur, no sensible diminution of evidence seems to be produced by the lapse of time. Take any ancient event that is well attested, such for example as the retreat of the ten thousand, and we are persuaded it will be generally admitted, that the certainty of that event having taken place, is as great at this moment as it was at the return of the Greek army, or when Xenophon published his history.”

CONCLUSION.

Thus have I endeavoured to shew the inconclusiveness of the whole reasoning, both of La Place and the Reviewer. They have assumed the very point in debate, and then reasoned from it as if it had been granted. They have called that experience, which is really testimony, and they have asserted an uniformity in it which has no existence. There are several other matters in the article we have been considering, which would also deserve to be brought under review; but it does not enter into my present plan to do any thing farther, than merely to point out the sophistry of the great argument which has been brought forward in such a triumphant manner. Neither is it any part of my present design, to bring into view the positive proofs by which the miracles of the Scriptures are supported. Those who wish for information on that point, will find it discussed in almost all the works on the evidences of Christianity. It may be sufficient here, for the sake of the general reader, to observe, that there are no presumptions against miracles being wrought in support of revealed religion; that there is a strong presumption in their favour, that the Supreme Being is the author of the laws of nature; that as it is by his power that these laws operate, so he must have the power of suspending or altering them when he sees meet;* that the establishment of revealed religion was an event of such importance to mankind, that it might have been expected that the Supreme Being would have interfered, and suspended or altered the laws of nature, to prove that it came from him.—It is also to be observed, that the miracles which were wrought in support of revelation, particularly of the gospel, were very numerous; of various kinds; of such a nature, that the witnesses could not have been deceived; that they were wrought before great numbers,—before enemies as well as friends; that those who lived at the time, and had the strongest interest in denying them, never did so; that the witnesses were very numerous, had no worldly interest to serve by their testimony; on the contrary, a very great proportion of them underwent the greatest sufferings, and many of them were subjected to a cruel death on account of their testimony, and that nevertheless not one of them ever drew back, and acknowledged they had been testifying a falsehood, though by doing so they might have escaped their sufferings.—

* This argument must have irresistible force with those who believe in the existence of a God, but can have no effect upon Atheists. It is probable, that the acute mind of Hume perceived this; and, therefore, while he laboured to undermine our belief of revealed religion by his doctrine about testimony, he laboured at the same time to undermine our belief of a great First Cause by his doctrine of cause and effect.

We may here appeal to *experience*, and say, does our experience of human nature, and of the course of human affairs, give us any ground to suspect, that men in such circumstances were not testifying the truth?*

It is a cause of deep regret, that any person should be found so hostile to the best interests of mankind, as to labour to make converts to infidelity. It is still more to be regretted, that a work which often displays such splendid abilities as the Edinburgh Review, should ever contain a single sentence which has even the appearance of such a tendency. The friends of humanity have been delighted with their zealous and persevering efforts in the cause of suffering Africa; and the friends of morality have been no less pleased with the severe chastisements which they have occasionally inflicted on licentious authors. What pity is it, that they do not see that neither humanity nor morals have any firm basis but Christianity? What extensive good might be done, were these talents occasionally employed in behalf of religion? It is long since the Reviewers declared, "That they were ready, whenever a fair opportunity offered, to defend Christianity against the tiger-spring of infidelity." Six years have elapsed since that declaration was made, and yet they have not redeemed their pledge. Can they say, that during that period nothing has occurred in their pages of an opposite tendency?

With regard to the final issue of any attack on Christianity, its friends have no occasion to feel any alarm. The attacks which hitherto have been made, have eventually been beneficial, inasmuch as they have given occasion to bring the evidences of its truth more clearly into view. It is still to be hoped, that every new attack will bring forward new talents in its defence. But though the general issue is perfectly safe, yet much partial mischief may be done, which ought to be carefully guarded against by every possible means. If the most popular and widely circulating journal in Europe, shall become a vehicle for infidel sentiments, how much harm may thus be done to the cause of religion? If, in addition to this, persons who are hostile to Christianity, fill such stations as give them easy access to the ductile and unsuspecting minds of youth, it certainly ought to excite no small degree of alarm among those, whose highest wish for the welfare of their children is, that they may be Christians.

* The reader may consult the work of Mr. Chalmers on Christianity, for a very masterly elucidation of this subject. *Quere*. Could it possibly be the appearance of this able work, which brought the long exploded doctrines of Hume again into view?

[The following article belongs to the head of "Original Communications," but is unavoidably placed after the "Selections."]

For the Religious Monitor.

ON MARRIAGE.

(Continued from page 415.)

When a professor of religion is joined in marriage to an irreligious husband or wife, the evil consequences which *may* follow to all concerned, are exceedingly numerous. Parents have sometimes with pain and sorrow to witness their children in great distress even as it regards this life—the property acquired by painful industry, and generously bestowed on the new-married pair, squandered and destroyed by an unprincipled prodigal, and nothing but poverty, shame and misery left. And it cannot be accounted a small addition to their distress, that they must themselves be related to this ungodly partner. In many cases frequent intercourse is unavoidable; they must see and hear his ungodly conversation; and the evening of their life is filled with bitterness and sorrow, by the imprudent conduct of that child, who ought to have been their comfort and solace. "I am weary of my life," says Rebekah in the name of thousands, "because of the daughters of Heth: if Jacob take a wife of the daughters of Heth, such as these which are of the daughters of the land, what good shall my life do me?" Still all this distress and trouble is comparatively light; for the dismal consequences of this connection, which stare them in the face, are nothing less, if mercy prevent not, than the apostacy and eternal ruin of their child, the object of their tenderest affection. They have no reason to anticipate any thing else. The common course of such connections makes it too evident. God's estimate of the case leaves them no room to hope. "For they will turn away thy son from following me to serve other Gods." They watched over him, they instructed him with painful care, they offered up many an ardent petition at the throne of grace in his behalf; but all is in vain! and with unutterable grief they must bid him a last adieu. This is nothing to you in your hours of giddiness and fantastic dreams, O ye ungrateful children! but the righteous God will not fail to measure it back to you at a moment when you cannot escape the bitter reflection, that it is what ye yourselves once measured.

To the individuals themselves the consequences are generally of the most serious kind. If, as has often happened, and as the Spirit of God declares will be most probable, he (to speak of the one sex what is equally true of the other) shall be drawn off from a profession of religion, he forsakes the way of life; he en-

ters on the ways of sin; and in these he makes progress. He braves the admonitions and reproofs of parents and ministers, which yet come fresh to his recollection—he stifles conviction. At length his conscience, becomes seared, and his mind reprobate. The corruptions of his heart, perpetually and powerfully excited by the conversation of a beloved partner, become irresistible, break over every restraint, and hurry him forward to endless ruin. And then all the advantages of early days serve but to increase his misery.

But I shall suppose him to be *really*, what he professes to be, a child of God. Then, it is true, he will never perish. *None* shall be able to pluck him out of Christ's hand; but how near perishing he may come, it is impossible to say. He may be left to advance fearfully in apostacy from the true religion, as we see in Solomon's case. He may commit great wickedness, and become a scandal and a reproach, and lose all the sensible comforts of religion and all evidences of an interest in Christ. And what must be his condition when conscience again awakens? Horrible darkness surrounds him, while that faithful witness utters its accusations with a voice that must be heard. Satan's awful suggestions crowd upon the thoughts. Out of the fire burning unto the midst of heaven, surrounded with blackness, and darkness, and tempest, the law speaks; and the clearest perceptions of the desert of sin are obtained. Who can describe the horrors which his soul must feel while it stands on the precipice, and looking down, exclaims, "Who can dwell in everlasting burnings? who can dwell with everlasting fire?" And who, that is not most deeply infatuated, would choose to lay up such sorrows, for a future day, for the sake of indulging a misplaced affection?

But again: let the case be that in which this child of God maintains his ground, and holds fast the profession of his faith without wavering. Something of spiritual life and vigour is kept up in his own soul; but what comfort or fellowship can he have in domestic duties? Just as much as light has with darkness, or Christ with Belial. His case resembles the monstrous production of two bodies joined together, the one of which dies, and the other has to drag out a miserable and wretched existence, carrying about the putrifying carcass. Even still more wretched must he be, who is inseparably joined to one dead in trespasses and sins; because his condition is the fruit of his *own* doings.—He voluntarily went into it—parents, ministers and conscience remonstrating against it. How monstrous in the view of angels must the sight be? An heir of heaven and a child of the devil

thus united! Surely, we cannot conceive of a greater hindrance in running the christian race. Besides, what a grief must it be to one who is awake to the perilous situation of a soul out of Christ; to see the very object of his tenderest regards, standing fully and constantly exposed to the danger? When the tender mother sees her infant tottering on the brink of the precipice, or when the affectionate wife beholds her husband ascend the scaffold a guilty criminal, her heart melts, her knees smite one against another, and her whole soul is convulsed within her; but unspeakably more moving to a righteous soul, awake to all the reality of the case, must be the spectacle of one so dear, sporting on the brink of hell.

But let it be said that the ungodly partner is of gentle, accommodating dispositions, and with little persuasion is induced to become a professor of religion. To you the burden is indeed lightened; but to the other it is only heaping up wrath against the day of wrath. It is adding hypocrisy to ungodliness—it is mocking God and abusing all the mercies of heaven; and all this only to gratify and please you. And if sometimes it may come to a happy issue, the credit is due to God's sovereign mercy only.

I would beg the reader next to glance at the effects of this unholy connection upon posterity. Suppose they become parents, and their children grow up to maturity. The children are deprived of *one parent* to instruct, direct, watch over and pray for them; and what is incomparably worse, they have one in his stead who disregards all the interests of the soul, and whose example is fatal. To him they naturally look up, and his example they imitate with the whole bent of their hearts. The diligence of the one parent in teaching them what is good, is more than counteracted by the other teaching what is evil. They are tenderly nursed, decently clothed; their habits carefully formed according to the rules of fashionable life; they are painfully instructed in all the branches of a liberal education; they are set down upon a respectable footing in the world to do for themselves; and perhaps they are accustomed to make a decent and regular appearance in the place of worship. But ah! their immortal souls are imprisoned in darkness. They are without God, without Christ, and ignorant of themselves. Every emotion of their hearts is enmity against heaven. Behind a fair moral character and a form of godliness, a hard and impenitent heart sits secure and bids defiance. No argument can touch it with conviction—no judgment can alarm it—no entreaty can soften it—harder than the adamant rock, it despises reproof. Than this, what condition is worse? What more hopeless in this world?—

They too become parents; and their children, *in their own likeness* and after *their own image*, grow up if possible still more corrupt; and their children's children in like manner. As they live, so they die, and lift up their eyes in torments, to which the judgments of Sodom and Gomorrah are not to be compared.

But there is still another direction in which this unholy match extends its branches, and brings forth destruction. Your children rise up in *the bosom of the church*—they are baptized—their moral character stands fair—and they, it may be, are admitted into fellowship with the church, and presently become efficient members. They bring with them, in disguise, a heart at war with the spirit of all divine institutions, and all the doctrine which is according to godliness. Their conversation, like a pestilence, poisons the atmosphere around them—their coldness chills the energies of the young convert. The more polished and acute they are, so much the more pernicious and deadly their influence. In times of backsliding and declension, when the competition is between truth and error, divine authority and human inventions, they throw all their weight into the scale of the latter. When the marriage of believers with unbelievers is extremely common, as it is now, they become a numerous and powerful class. They may be men of talent and liberal spirit, and forthwith every place of trust and authority is assigned to them. Then, alas! foundations are razed; and the church, which numbers them as her members, is nothing but a heap of rubbish.—Then personal and family religion disappears—the duty of witnessing which was the glory of other times, becomes a reproach—discipline, the hedge about the church, is now torn down, and the wild beast comes in and tramples down and rends at his pleasure. From the pulpit you hear morality, metaphysics, philosophy, or any other fashionable theme, with great eloquence; but Christ crucified, is not there. All but the dead form is now gone. Under it, the lusts of the flesh feel no restraint, and it serves to conceal their hideous forms from the light. Lust joins lust, corruption swells into a mighty torrent and carries all before it. Every disguise is thrown off, and that hellish brood described 2 Tim. chap. iii. appears in the church. “This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come; for men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God, having a *form of godliness*, but denying the power thereof.”

This, at first view, may perhaps be thought to carry the matter too far; but we fear that, taking the scriptures for our guide, we dare not soften the picture. By leaving the children of parents who have formed such alliances, almost without exception, to awful eminence in wickedness, God seems to have set the stamp of his disapprobation on such marriages as a warning to future generations. Before the flood, "The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair, and they took them wives of all whom they chose." The very next words intimate to us that these sons of God, as well as their children, had lost all sense of religion and become wicked in the extreme. All flesh had corrupted his way, and the earth was filled with violence. Such were the consequences in that instance. Lot's daughters marry in Sodom, and their fearful destruction tells us that they gave up with all that was good and became as wicked as their husbands. Abraham marries Hagar; and Ishmael, a profane mocker, is the fruit of it, and he is excommunicated. His mother takes to him a woman of a similar description, and he becomes the father of a band of robbers, and his posterity continue to be so to this day. Esau marries the daughters of Heth; he throws off the very form of religion, and his posterity become gross idolaters. Jacob marries his two hand-maids, and the sons descended of them are so wicked and profane, that when Joseph brings to his father their evil report, such is their deadly hatred that nothing short of a brother's blood will satisfy them. Judah marries Shuah a Canaanite. Er and Onan, the sons of this woman, are so exceedingly wicked that divine vengeance overtakes them, and their very names are to this day held up to execration.—Shalomoth, an Israelitish woman marries an Egyptian, and her son blasphemes the name of the Lord, and is stoned to death.—David takes to wife a daughter of Talmi, king of Geshur, and Absalom, whose character needs no comment, is her son. Many others of a similar description might be added. Unless God interpose his sovereign mercy, which he has not allowed us in his word to expect, such will be the consequences, and such the characters that spring of this connection still; and what has either church or state reason to expect when such as these become the ruling party?

But I shall now consider another case in which the scripture rule is violated, viz: when both profess to be Christians, but are of different denominations. The evil consequences which *may* follow from the nature of this connection, are very many. Let us first suppose, what very frequently happens, that one of the parties yields up his profession and falls in with the other. This, in

most cases, is to apostatize from what the person declared by his former profession to be the truth of God, and go over to the side of error and defection, for no other reason than to gratify a partner. The consequences of this step are, that many godly persons are filled with grief and sorrow—backsliders are countenanced and strengthened—the infidel takes notice of it with a sneer at all revealed religion, and is more confirmed in his infidelity—Satan triumphs. But has it no bad effects on the person himself who has made this change? Yes: he finds himself obliged to go much farther than he had any idea of going, for the sake of consistency. He is impelled to use much false reasoning in order to relieve his mind from painful conviction; and to do violence to the arguments by which he was used to be established in his former profession, and all the pains of parents and ministers, in using them for this end. Such conduct must either give the greatest pain and uneasiness to his mind, rendering him exceedingly unhappy; or, which I believe to be the most frequent effect, it will harden his heart, sear his conscience, and prepare him for going farther in the ways of apostacy.

But suppose, what is sometimes the case, that neither party leaves his profession. Determined however to maintain domestic tranquillity at any rate, they agree to make a private accommodation between the two professions. Each must give up something, and each is to receive some countenance and some support; but neither party is to go so far in support of peculiarities as might wound the feelings of the other. Now it is obvious that neither of the churches has any peculiar interest in their family prayers, or their countenance and support; and the consequences which natively follow are, a condemnation of all those tenets and practices in which they differ from each other, and a feeling of indifference towards the particular interests of both. This is the only sure way to destroy party feeling and secure domestic peace. But when their minds have come to this point, it is almost impossible for them not to go farther. From indifference about one particular of truth or duty, the transition is exceedingly small to indifference about another, until the mind at length feels indifferent towards religion altogether, and the immortal soul is exposed to imminent danger. The church too is made to suffer materially through this indifference: her energies are impaired in proportion to the number of such characters in her fellowship; the authority of her discipline is weakened, and her secular affairs are neglected. If she shall happen to be vibrating between truth and error, such persons without much difficulty give their weight to the latter; and at any rate withhold

it from the former. When persons of their state of feeling are very numerous in the church, then sure enough party spirit disappears—*little things* and *non-essentials* are consigned to oblivion—peace and harmony prevail far and wide. But it is at the expense of truth and holiness. Besides their own individual weight in the scale, these characters draw in others. Their example and conversation is like infection to acquaintances and friends; and their children rise up and walk in their footsteps; and the tide of indifference swells, love waxes cold and iniquity abounds.

Lastly: suppose that each party stands out for all the peculiarities of his profession, and will make no compromise; then “the house is divided against itself,” in circumstances the most painful to the feelings. How can they have fellowship at all?—Their sabbaths and their prayers are divided between different assemblies, different doctrines and worship. If they converse or pray together, they must necessarily be confined to what is general; but that is not the way of the heart. Frequently it happens that party feeling breaks over all restraint, and comes forth into an open rupture; and then things come to a miserable pass; contention enters into every domestic and public duty of religion. The return of the christian sabbath, which ought to gladden every Christian’s heart, serves in their house only to bring up the whole quarrel afresh to the memory. The closer their relation is, so much the more bitter their animosities and their language. Luther and the Pope scarcely opposed one another with greater keenness. What a disgrace is such a state of things to the christian name—what a check to the progress of religion in the soul, and what a nuisance to the whole neighbourhood where it happens? Its effects upon the children of such parents are not easy to be conceived. Sometimes they are wholly neglected, and left to themselves as respects religious matters; in which case some of them grow up not only in ignorance, but in hatred and disgust at religion, as a thing associated in their earliest recollections with the most hateful quarrels between their parents. Sometimes they are forcibly drawn over to the one side, and sometimes to the other, and at other times they are divided. In the former case, the breach of the fifth commandment to one parent, is sanctioned by the authority and countenance of the other: in the latter case the family is drawn up into two hostile bands, with a parent at the head of each, continually on the watch to give each other battle. Even here the evil does not stop. These children keep up the spirit of discord; and after the parents have gone to the house of silence, they transmit it to their posterity undiminished.

Who then, I ask, that sincerely regards either himself or posterity, or that is a true friend either to church or state, or that compassionates the souls of men, or seeks the glory of God, can wilfully and deliberately form the connection which produces such a train of deadly evils, or even think of others doing it, without the liveliest emotions of sorrow and concern for the interests at stake? God, in marvellous mercy to individuals, families and congregations, sometimes overrules the connection, and causes it to bring forth good: but when or how often he will do so, we know not. But even if this were known with certainty, it could not in the least set aside the authority of the scriptures, which prohibit such marriages, or make our conduct less criminal. The churches generally treat this matter with neglect, and feel perfectly indifferent about it; multitudes of professors of the most respectable class, without regard to the divine precept, marry whomsoever they choose: but the consequences will yet arouse the most careless and alarm the most secure. Many begin to perceive that the churches are rapidly on the decline; that evangelical doctrine, purity of worship and ministerial faithfulness, are becoming rare; while profanity, and vice in every form, greatly abound; and the hue and cry is raised against leading men and popular schemes as the *cause* of all the mischief;—whereas these are only some of the *effects* of this concealed and unsuspected cause—the marriage of those who are *not* of one heart and one mind. Only remove this cause, and these evils complained-of will disappear. But without this, all your efforts will amount only to throwing water on the flame, while the fire will continue to burn beneath in all its fury.

Some will reply, “What can we do? we have neither power nor authority to meddle with such an affair, we cannot *command* the young not to marry this or that one, as we please.” It were enough to answer, that both in the Old and New Testaments there are positive injunctions laid upon you to prevent this great evil in the church—see ye to it. But much might be advanced to show that this is a weak pretence. It is true, were some of your relations or acquaintances proposing to marry some decrepit and diseased inmate of the hospital, or some wretched mendicant, or a slave, or a criminal, you could not perhaps prevent it; but which of you would give a silent acquiescence? which of you would not employ all your powers to dissuade from such a dishonourable match? And which of you could not do *this*, to prevent the ruin of the churches, did you actually feel the prosperity of religion and the glory of God to be more important than the colour of the skin or the shape of the body?

After all, what can be said to private Christians? The ministers, who ought to be ensamples to the flock, and who profess to declare the whole counsel of God and keep nothing back, are silent—yea, themselves are guilty. Gravity, sincerity, meekness, sobriety, are less sought after than fashionable accomplishments, fortune and outward appearance. The consequence is, a powerful example set before the church of violating this scriptural rule: and all who incline may follow it, not only secure from the minister's reproof, but confident of his approbation. His public usefulness depends much on his private deportment; and that depends very much on the temper and taste of his partner: and when she is such, that a mistake in etiquette, or to be behind the fashion, gives her unspeakably more uneasiness than a profanation of the holy sabbath by idle talk, his usefulness will soon be limited and come to an end; but the consequences to the church and posterity will not so soon terminate.

In conclusion, I would beg of the unmarried reader, especially if in the holy ministry, or preparing for it, seriously and repeatedly to consider how much is at stake in the right or wrong management of the marriage contract. Through means of one the churches will be happily arrested in their courses of defection, or hurried forward by the other to final apostacy and extinction. By promoting reformation or defection here, you will be instrumental in training up for eternal glory, or in fitting for perdition, generations yet unborn.

EGO.

Summary of Religious Intelligence.

PALESTINE.—The Missionaries, Messrs. Gridley and Brewer, who sailed for Palestine in September last, arrived safely at Malta, on the 13th of Nov. Letters of that date have been received from them. The youth Asaad, whom we formerly mentioned as exposed to the severest persecution by his friends and the ecclesiastical authorities at Beyroot, for his profession of Christianity, still continues to hold fast his profession; and his persecutors, finding their labour in vain, seem to be disposed to relax. He is, however, still under their power.

SANDWICH ISLANDS.—An examination of those under instruction in Lahaina, took place in October last: there were present *nineteen* schools, containing *nine hundred and twenty-two* scholars; the progress made by the scholars, was very satisfactory. The whole number of scholars in Lahaina, amounts to about 1,400. On the whole Island, they probably exceed 3,000. The natives have 15 or 20 vessels, but no vessel commences its voyage on the Sabbath, the example of *Christian* seamen to the contrary notwithstanding.

IRELAND.—It is said that great numbers of the Catholics in Ireland, especially in the county of Cavan, are renouncing popery and embracing the Protestant religion.

UNITED STATES.—From a report of the Methodist Missionary Society of Tennessee, it appears that there is at this time 21 missionary stations among the Indians of the United States occupied by Methodist ministers; and great

improvement is said to reward their labours. The children are taught to read and write, agriculture is becoming more common, circuits have been formed, camp meetings have been held and numerously attended, and 400 have been converted, and "rejoice with their white brethren in the hope of their common rest." It has now become so common a thing to tell, in letters and reports, the exact number that have been converted at our missionary stations, and at the scenes of our Revivals, that we should be glad to know by what means, information of the state and character of men, is so readily attained, as to warrant the confidence and precision usual in these statements. To us, we confess it is a mystery. We have always been accustomed to consider a full assurance of personal interest in salvation, as an attainment comparatively rare, even among those who are really the children of God; but judging from the tone and manner of almost every account of these things, which appears in our public prints, the fact must be far otherwise. It is easy to make a representation that has a very flattering and imposing appearance; and the ease, nay, eagerness, with which the loosest and most improbable accounts, are printed and circulated without examination into their truth, is calculated to do the most serious injury to religion, and to impair confidence in every vehicle of religious intelligence. The following intelligence is a specimen of this kind of writing.

REVIVAL IN ALBANY.—In an extract from a letter in the Philadelphian of the 9th ultimo, from their correspondent near the city of Albany, N. Y. dated, January 29th, 1827, it is stated, after mentioning the revival in Canaan, Lebanon, Richmond, &c. that "Albany too is visited with blessings." This is true in many a sense, though perhaps not quite in the sense intended.—About the close of last year and the beginning of the present, there were some indications of the commencement of what is called a Revival of religion, but which has some time since nearly, if not totally subsided.—At all events we hear nothing of it here; this letter has been written a little too early. The writer goes on to say, "Many, very many, in that wicked city, have commenced a new era in their lives," which is doubtless intended to convey the idea, that many, very many, have been converted, and have begun a life of holiness. We sincerely wish this may be the case, though we have not heard of it, and we are inclined to think it will be *news* to the greater part of our citizens. What follows will certainly, at least, be considered as an

EXTRAORDINARY CASE.—It is added in the above letter, "we are told as a matter of fact, that in the town of Brunswick in this county, but one single adult person is left in unbelief—that all—male and female, old and young, with the above solitary exception, are born into the kingdom"!! Here, again, we must express our astonishment, not merely at the extraordinary alleged fact, but no less how it could be ascertained!

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.—By the Catalogue of students in the Auburn Theological Seminary, it appears that there are in all 65 students attending that institution, which is devoted to the propagation of the Hopkinsian heresy. A missionary spirit is said to be increasing among them. At the Seminary at Princeton which is, in opposition to Hopkinsianism, decidedly orthodox, there are in all 93 students. We hope that missionaries will be selected from the latter school.

THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY.—Since the beginning of last year have printed more than *two millions* of Tracts, amounting to an aggregate of *twenty millions* of pages. Pity it is, by a constitutional provision, to gag the mouth of an instrument capable of being so efficient in the cause of religion, and thereby prevent it from declaring the **WHOLE TRUTH**.

REFORMED DUTCH EDUCATION SOCIETY.—The Classis of Albany have constituted themselves an *Education Society* for preparing indigent young men to enter the gospel ministry. The president of Classis to be president of the Society. A committee of five denominated the *Executive Committee*, are to decide upon all applications and make all appropriations of money. A per-

son receiving aid, must be in the communion of the Dutch church, must be guided by the Executive Committee in the course of study he pursues, and must give a written pledge to refund *one-quarter* of what he receives, if he continues in the Dutch church, and the *whole* if he goes to another denomination.

Select Religious Intelligence.

IGNORANCE AND SUPERSTITION AT JERUSALEM.

The following facts are related by Messrs. Fisk and King.

It is the custom of the Pacha of Damascus to come up to Jerusalem once a year, to collect tribute, both from Christians and Mussulmans; and his coming is generally a precursor of distress and sorrow. It may emphatically be said, during his stay here, that "these be days of vengeance."

Towards night we went to the church of the Holy Sepulchre to hear the sermons of the Latin priests, and to witness their idolatrous worship. There were delivered, as is usual on the anniversary of the crucifixion, seven sermons. Four were in Spanish, two in Italian, and one in Arabic. "The first scene of the theatre," as one of their own priests, who assisted in the performance, remarked to us, was in the chapel of the Roman Catholics. Into this we entered a little after sunset, where we saw, arranged in order, and clothed in splendid robes, the priests of Terra Santa. In a few minutes the doors were shut, the lights all extinguished, and one of these sons of darkness arose, and began a sermon in Italian. He had not uttered more than three or four sentences, before he began to tell how big the emotions were that filled his breast, and changed the tones of his voice much sooner than a common tragedian would have done in a French theatre; so soon, that no one, I presume, could have been affected. Indeed his art was so manifest, and ill-timed, that I could feel nothing in my own bosom but disgust. After having spoken fifteen or twenty minutes, he named the cross, and at that instant, a little door, which led into an adjoining apartment, opened, and a man entered with a light, bearing a large wooden cross. "Ecco vienne," cried the preacher, "nel momento proposito;" ("Behold it comes in the moment prophesied;") and kneeling before it, said, "Thee, O cross, we revere, and thee we adore;" ("Tu, O croce, ti reveriamo, et ti adoriamo.")

The second sermon was delivered at the place, where, it is said, the garments of our Lord were divided: the third, where he was beaten; and the fourth, where he was nailed to the cross. These were in Spanish.

At the last mentioned place, the cross was laid on the floor, and a wooden image about the size of little babe, attached to it. As I saw the priests kneeling around it, with lighted wax candles in their hands, I said within myself, "surely ye have crucified to yourselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame."

After this farce, they brought the image on the cross to the place, where, they say, stood the cross of our Lord. There they planted it, and a sermon was delivered in Italian, which, though rather coarse, contained some just sentiments, with regard to the sorrows of the suffering Jesus. Towards the close, the speaker addressed the image, and concluded by saying, "We wait now for Joseph of Arimathaea, to come and take down the body."

The pretended Joseph soon came, and with hammers and pincers drew out the nails from the hands and feet of the image, took it down with great apparent care, and wrapped it in a fine linen cloth.

From the place of crucifixion, the image was carried down to the stone of unction, and anointed with some kind of ointment, and sprinkled with perfumed waters; after which a sermon was delivered in Arabic. The sermon was long, the Arabic badly pronounced, and the speaker often broke out in apostrophes, and prosopopeias, addressing stars, rocks, angels, Jews, &c.; but, I was pleased with it, as containing the birth, life, sufferings, and death of our Saviour, who, he said, laid down his life for our sins.

From the stone of unction, the image was carried to the sepulchre, and laid in the tomb, at the door of which a sermon was delivered in Spanish, and the scene was closed.

Seldom have I had such feelings with regard to the Christian religion, as I had while witnessing this tragic scene, acted in one of the most interesting, one of the most sacred places on earth,—on Mount Calvary,—in the house of God,—at the place where the Son of God suffered. Never did I feel so ashamed of the name of Christian: I know of no scene on earth so calculated to make a man an infidel.

Pagan Christians! Idolatrous worshippers of Christ! Who can go to a Jew or a Mussulman, in Jerusalem, and ask him to embrace the Christian religion? Ye have defiled the sanctuary of the Lord, and put the Son of God to open shame!—*Rel. Intel.*

THE CASE OF MORGAN.

In our last we mentioned the result of the trial of the persons charged with the abduction of this man. Another trial has taken place with results equally unsatisfactory, as it respects any certain clue to his fate. Nicholas G. Chesebro, Harris Seymour, Henry Howard and Moses Roberts, were indicted by the grand jury for a conspiracy to convict William Morgan of petit larceny. The trial came on at the Ontario General Sessions on the 23d ultimo. The judge entered a nolle prosqui in reference to Chesebro, (he being in jail pursuant to the sentence of the former court,) and the trial of the others proceeded. After the testimony in behalf of the prosecution closed, the counsel for the defendants did not produce any witnesses, but raised a question as to the validity of the indictment, and it was *quashed on account of informality*. Previous to this trial, however, the result of the former had aroused the inhabitants to greater energy, and a determination to investigate the fate of Morgan to the utmost of their ability. County and town meetings were held, and committees appointed from nine different meetings, to form a joint committee to endeavour to trace his fate. This committee entered immediately on their duty, and with diligence, perseverance and determination, pursued their investigations in the face of every opposition. Nor have their investigations been in vain; they find, however, that they have not the power necessary to compel a full disclosure of this high handed crime, and therefore, they have applied by petition to the legislature, now in session, to strengthen their hands so as to obtain a full investigation of the affair. The following extracts from their petition, presented to the Legislature on the 9th instant, give a brief relation of the result of their labours, and opens up a wide-spread scene of wickedness, unparalleled in the annals of crime!

To the Honourable the Legislature of the State of New-York, in Senate and Assembly convened.

The Petition of sundry persons, members of committees appointed by the counties of Genesee, Ontario, Livingston, Monroe and Niagara, to investigate the circumstances of the abduction of one William Morgan, and to endeavour to discover and bring to punishment the perpetrators of the outrage committed upon his liberty or life, respectfully represents:

That your petitioners have done all in their power to perform faithfully the duties thus imposed upon them, by their fellow citizens; that during such investigation, your petitioners have ascertained to their own satisfaction, that the said William Morgan was seized in the village of Batavia, on the 11th day of September last, by certain persons, with a pretended legal process, and although the said Morgan was at that time confined on the limits of Genesee county jail, he was without his consent, forcibly put into a carriage and conveyed to the village of Canandaigua, where he was examined as to the alleged charge, and no cause of complaint was found against him; but that, notwithstanding, he was arrested by another process procured to be issued for the purpose, and confined in the jail of Ontario county; that on the evening of the 12th of the same month, those persons who procured him to be thus

confined, or others, confederates with them, procured his liberation, and took him from the said jail, and forcibly and against his consent, placed him, gagged and bound, in a carriage, and conveyed him, or caused him to be conveyed, as far as Hanford's Landing, near the mouth of the Genesee river; that on the 13th of the same month, the same persons, or others confederate with them, conveyed him in the same forcible and violent manner, by means of relays of horses, provided for that purpose, by many different individuals, along the ridge road to Lewiston, and on the morning of the 14th of the same month, after conveying him to the distance of 120 miles, in little more than 24 hours, lodged him in Fort Niagara, where he was confined and forcibly detained against his inclination and consent; that he was either detained in confinement in the said fort, during the 14th, or, as your petitioners have some reason to believe, was forcibly conveyed across the Niagara river, out of the territory of the United States, and upon some of the confederates refusing to receive him there, was in the same forcible manner, reconveyed to the said fort, and detained in confinement; that on the night of the 14th, the said Morgan was, by the persons who procured him to be thus spirited away, or by others confederate with them, forcibly and deliberately murdered, by having his throat cut from ear to ear, his tongue torn out, and his body consigned to the depths of Niagara river or Lake Ontario: that these several horrid outrages from the time of Morgan's seizure at Canandaigua, were perpetrated without even the form of legal process, and without any even pretended offence against the laws of this land.

[The petition then goes on to represent the transactions in relation to the attempt to set fire to the printing-office of David C. Miller, the attack made upon David C. Miller himself, and his being forcibly seized and detained till rescued by his friends, and adds:]

Your petitioners have reason to believe that the said David C. Miller was seized for the purpose of conveying him to Hanford's Landing, and from that point to convey him, together with Morgan, to Fort Niagara, and with an intention and determination that he should share the same horrid fate.

But your petitioners would further represent that there are many and apparently insurmountable difficulties in the way of a thorough investigation of this affair, in the usual legal method. Among other things, your petitioners would represent, as a circumstance well calculated to excite alarm, that the persons implicated in this affair, are many of them men of respectable standing and leading influence in this community, some of them formerly members of your honourable body, others officers of justice both executive and judicial, holding high and responsible stations in the administration of our laws.

The witnesses too, which would be necessary to warrant a grand jury in finding an indictment, are numerous and scattered over an extent of country, of perhaps more than one hundred and fifty miles, and if willing, can be collected only with great difficulty and expense to them individually; and in many instances the most important and essential witnesses have shown themselves unwilling to relate their knowledge of the facts, and by their absence at the times when they are wanted, and by other means, have, and it may be expected will continue to retard, if not entirely defeat, the investigation.

Your petitioners would therefore represent to your honourable body, that as this is a peculiar and extraordinary outrage, so it demands a peculiar and extraordinary remedy.

Your petitioners would therefore pray your honourable body, taking into consideration the circumstances set forth in this petition, that your body would pass an act appointing a committee or commissioners, with the most ample powers, to visit this theatre of injustice—to investigate the facts and circumstances attending its commission—to send for persons and examine them on oath touching the matters in this petition mentioned, and to be authorised to compel the attendance of such witnesses, and also to compel them to answer on oath, touching such matters as they may lawfully be compelled to answer, and to preserve a record of such testimony, to report to your honourable body, that your body may enact such law or take such order thereon, as your body shall deem meet and proper.

View of Public Affairs.

We are again obliged to crowd this department into a small space; this, however, will be sufficient to contain a brief notice of the most important intelligence of the last month.

EUROPE.

GREAT-BRITAIN.—The last arrivals, brought the accounts of the death of the Duke of York, on the 5th of January, in the 64th year of his age. By his death the Duke of Clarence, now 62 years of age, becomes the next heir to the crown, and in the event of his decease, Alexandrina, the daughter of the late Duke of Kent, now in her 8th year. The promptness with which aid was sent to assist the Portuguese in repelling the aggressions of Spain, has been well received throughout the kingdom; and additional troops have embarked on the same destination. The Duke of Wellington has been appointed Commander in Chief, in the place of the Duke of York deceased. He has expressed his determination to remove none who have received their appointment from his predecessor.

PORTUGAL.—The British troops sent to aid the Constitutionalists, had arrived at Lisbon, and were received by one party, with acclamations, and by others with great coolness. Previous to their arrival the Constitutionalists themselves, had succeeded in several encounters with the insurgents, and had driven them from the greater part of the Portuguese territory. No account of their operations has yet arrived.

SPAIN.—So far as appearances go, the French ministry have been using their influence to induce Ferdinand to acknowledge the Portuguese court and regency. The decision of the contest between Spain and Portugal, will probably depend upon the course which France will ultimately pursue. Though her professions are pacific, it is thought that no great confidence can be placed in them. The Jesuits, ultra royalists, and haters of England, form a numerous and influential party, and are strongly inclined for war in support of the measures of the Spanish king, and whether the government take part in the war or not, he will no doubt receive powerful support from this quarter.—The decided tone of Mr. Canning's speech is said to have united all parties in Spain, and active preparations are making for war. The proceedings of the Spanish cabinet are kept a profound secret; 100,000 muskets are said to have been purchased in France, for Spain. Upon the whole, the continuance of the peace of Europe appears more doubtful than it formerly did.

GREECE.—Accounts from this country can scarcely be called any thing else than mere rumours. The war for some time seems to have been nearly stationary. Athens, however, has been evacuated by the Turks, and again occupied by the Greeks. The Pacha of Egypt is said to be determined to prosecute the war, and 78 sail of vessels to have left Alexandria for Greece. The most important intelligence respecting this country is from a paragraph in the London Times, which is as follows: "There is at length good ground for congratulating Europe on the adoption of a final and decisive measure on behalf of Greece, by the three great powers of Great-Britain, France, and Russia. The cabinets of London and St. Petersburg had, some time ago, transmitted their *ultimatum* to Turkey, on this subject. The court of the Thuiries has acceded to the policy of its allies within the last fortnight, and resistance by Turkey to their joint demands is wholly out of the question. The point insisted on amounts to nothing less than a full recognition, by the Porte, of the absolute and entire independence of the Greek nation, which recognition is to be officially communicated to the parties requiring it by a given day; failing of which the ambassadors of the allied Christian courts are, on that same day, simultaneously to quit Constantinople. Consuls were, at the expiration of the *ultimatum*, to be sent to Greece, from England, France, and Russia."

From Asia and Africa, we have no intelligence of any consequence.

AMERICA.

SOUTH AMERICA.—The arrival of Bolivar in Venezuela seems to have settled the disturbances which for some time have existed in these countries. A power, approaching to absolute, has been conferred upon him or assumed by him, to which, it appears, submission is readily yielded. The affairs of Buenos Ayres and Peru continue in the same situation as before.

UNITED STATES.—Congress adjourned on the 3d inst. The bill laying an additional tax on woollens, which has occupied a great portion of their time, has not been passed. The Report of the Committee on foreign commerce, the object of which was to exclude all vessels from the British Colonial possessions from the ports of the U. S. unless Great-Britain shall grant the same freedom of access to her colonies, to vessels of the U. S. as to her own, (the carrying trade between G. Britain and these provinces excepted,) has not been agreed to, owing to the great difference of opinion which existed respecting it. The matter of course stands now as it did at the meeting of Congress. It is however generally believed, that there will be no difficulty in arranging this matter in a reasonable way by treaty.

The differences with Georgia are not yet adjusted. The history of this difficulty, is the following : The Legislature of Georgia, in 1795, sold the right of the state to purchase from the Indians certain territory within her boundaries, formerly and now, possessed by the Creeks, Cherokees, &c. to certain companies, for the consideration of some millions of dollars. The Legislature of the next year rescinded the deed of the preceding one, on the ground of its having been obtained by improper means, and many members of the Legislature themselves belonging to these companies. The purchasers, nevertheless, considered their claim valid, insisted that the Legislature had not the power to annul the contract made with them, and appealed to the Supreme court of the United States. The United States took up the matter and a negotiation was concluded in 1802 by which the right of pre-emption was ceded to the United States by both parties, on condition of paying certain sums to the state of Georgia and to these companies, from the proceeds of the sale of said lands, as soon as the Indian title could be extinguished, by treaty or otherwise.—This has been done from time to time, as portions of this territory could be obtained from the Indian proprietors. In 1825, some chiefs representing themselves to be authorised by their nations, ceded all the lands within the lines of Georgia, on certain conditions. This, however, was found to have been effected without the consent, and contrary to the will, of these nations. It was therefore annulled in 1826, and a treaty entered into with the Indians, by which all the territory claimed by Georgia, was obtained, except about 60,000 acres. Georgia, however, eager for possession, is for adhering to the negotiation of 1825, ceding the whole, and has sent on her surveyors to survey and lay it out into lots, which right she claims, not only on the ground of the said negotiation, but likewise on the ground of the sovereignty which she claims over the whole territory within her lines. This claim of sovereignty, however, is totally unfounded, as by the Constitution of the United States, the Indians are considered as foreign nations, having entire sovereignty over the territory which belongs to them; and there is an express law, which forbids the survey of lands unceded by the Indians. On these grounds, the Indians forbid and resist the survey of the unceded territory. This Georgia threatens to effect by force. And as the general Government is bound to protect the Indians in their rights, this force, if employed, must be resisted by the United States, intimation of which, has been given to Georgia. This matter was referred by the President to Congress, with an expression of his determination to resist the claims of Georgia, by force, if necessary, the existing laws of the United States remaining unaltered, and submitting the propriety of further legislation on this subject. The committee appointed on this business, in their report, recommend pacific measures, as far as possible, expressing a belief that a resort to force will not be necessary, and that the United States endeavour to extinguish the Indian title as soon as possible.—Governor Troup has sent a letter to the Secretary of War, setting the United States at defiance, and has ordered the Georgia militia to be ready for a *set to* !